

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ROBERT E. LEE.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the speech delivered yesterday by my colleague, Hon. CHARLES M. STEDMAN, on the anniversary of the birth of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered yesterday by his colleague, Maj. STEDMAN, on the life and character of Gen. Robert E. Lee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FUNERAL OF ADMIRAL DEWEY.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Senate is waiting for the House to go to the Rotunda to attend the funeral of Admiral Dewey. I suggest that the House, attended by the Sergeant at Arms, now proceed to the Rotunda.

The SPEAKER. The Members of the House in a body will proceed to the Rotunda.

At 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a. m. the House of Representatives, preceded by the Speaker and the Sergeant at Arms, proceeded to the Rotunda, where was held the funeral of George Dewey, Admiral of the Navy.

At 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a. m. the Members of the House of Representatives returned to the Hall, and the Speaker resumed the chair.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. DAVENPORT, for 10 days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 32 minutes a. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 22, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 20345) granting a pension to Malissa Giles Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 20346) granting a pension to Albert Helms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20347) granting a pension to Frank Logsdon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 20348) granting an increase of pension to Mary Pickens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 20349) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Somers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 20350) granting an increase of pension to Ernest J. Patton; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of the Humanitarian Cult in favor of the passage of the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Dr. F. A. Eastman and others, of Rockford, Ill., protesting against increase of postal rates on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany H. R. 19911, for relief of Alphonso G. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 22, 1917.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast made our human responsibility commensurate with the gifts of Thy providence and grace. Thou hast unlocked the treasure house of earth and there stand about us ministers and messengers to do our bidding. Too often we have turned these forces of nature that Thou hast put at our command into instruments of human destruction. Too often Thy winged messengers have carried evil deeds to regions beyond.

We confess before Thee our national sins, and we pray Thee to guide us and guard us and bring us back into harmony with Thy will. May the time speedily come when we shall beat our spears into pruning hooks and our swords into plowshares. Then the peace and glory of God shall be upon this and every land. Then the time shall come when the knowledge and glory of God shall fill the whole world. We ask for Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Secretary read the communication, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 21, 1917.

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is a communication concerning the foreign relations of the country which I think it my duty to make to the Senate and which I should very much like to make in person. I would be very much obliged if I might be afforded an opportunity to do so to-morrow, the 22d, if it can be arranged without inconvenience to the Senate.

I know of no way other than this informal way in which to convey this wish to the Senators. I have spoken to Senator STONE, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, about it, and have asked him to confer with you.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield? This is an important question and I think we ought to have a quorum. Some question may arise afterwards and we would save time by getting a quorum here.

Mr. STONE. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Hitchcock	Norris	Smoot
Beckham	Hollis	Overman	Sterling
Brady	Husting	Page	Stone
Brandegee	James	Pittman	Sutherland
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Poindexter	Thomas
Catron	Jones	Ransdell	Thompson
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Reed	Townsend
Clark	Kern	Robinson	Vardaman
Culbertson	La Follette	Saulsbury	Warren
Cummins	Lodge	Shaftroth	Weeks
Dillingham	McCumber	Sheppard	Williams
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Works
Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Ga.	
Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent an account of sickness. I wish this announcement to stand for the day. My colleague is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP].

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan]. On all votes he is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there were so many Senators absent when the communication from the President was read, I ask that it may again be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read it.

The Secretary again read the communication.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will venture to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations whether, this being a matter touching our foreign relations, we are to be addressed by the President in executive session or in open session?

Mr. STONE. It is not, as I understand the communication, a matter that needs to be presented in executive session.

Mr. GALLINGER. I presume the Senator from Missouri has accurate knowledge on that question and, of course, I do not raise any objection, but—

Mr. STONE. The inquiry is a very proper one.

Mr. GALLINGER. We have been so careful, and it has been suggested to us that we ought to be very careful, about discussing matters of our foreign relations in open session. I wondered whether there was to be a departure from that custom.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I move that the Chair appoint a committee of five Senators to inform the President that the Senate will be pleased to receive him at 1 o'clock post meridian to-day, and that the same committee receive him on his arrival at the Capitol and escort him to the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed as the committee Mr. KERN, Mr. STONE, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. GALLINGER, and Mr. KENYON.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently said: The Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] has requested to be excused from service on the committee to wait on the President of the United States and to escort him to the Senate Chamber. The Chair appoints the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] in the place of the Senator from Indiana.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] also asks to be excused, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] in his place.

TARGET PRACTICE IN THE NAVY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 11th instant, the number of scores made on the 30 by 90 foot screen by the vessels of the Atlantic Fleet in the division day and individual battle practices in the seasons of 1914, 1915, and 1916, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 18994) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of certain public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for certain public buildings; to abolish the Office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury and to create and organize in the Treasury Department a bureau of public buildings and define its duties, powers, and jurisdiction; to create and establish the office of commissioner of public buildings; to fix the salary and prescribe the duties and powers of the said commissioner of public buildings; to create a board of estimates and prescribe its duties and powers; to provide for the standardization of certain classes of public buildings, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Me., praying for the passage of the so-called Webb bill relating to foreign trade, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Augusta and Auburn, in the State of Maine, and of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for an increase of pension for survivors of the Civil War under certain regulations, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Association of Fully Disabled Union Veterans of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for an increase of pension to those who lost limbs during the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Crocker Post, No. 12, Grand Army of the Republic, of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the repeal of the rules and regulations relating to the granting of pensions, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STONE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of West Plains, Mo., remonstrating against any change in postal rates on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina presented petitions of sundry citizens of South Carolina, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Taunton, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to exempt the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad from the provisions of the Panama Canal act prohibiting the opera-

tion of steamship lines by railroads in certain cases, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maryland, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented a memorial of Typographical Union No. 231, of San Jose, Cal., remonstrating against a change in second-class postal rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 7748) to authorize the United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co., and such other corporation or individuals as may be associated with it, to construct a bridge across the portion of the Delaware River between the mainland of the county of Camden and State of New Jersey, and Petty Island in said county and State, and I submit a report (No. 959) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments of the committee were, on page 1, line 10, after the word "River," to insert "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation," and, on page 2, line 1, after the word "of," to strike out the words "Bridges over navigable waters" and insert "the act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,'" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co., a corporation created and organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey, and such other corporation or individuals, if any, as shall be associated with said company for the purpose, their successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the intervening portion of the Delaware River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, from the mainland of Camden County, in the State of New Jersey, to Petty Island, in said county and State, in accordance with the provisions of "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and that said bridge may be either for railroad purposes alone, or in part for railroad and in part for highway purposes, at the option of said United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, on Friday last I introduced a bill (S. 7936) authorizing the Secretary of War to establish on the military reservation on the arsenal grounds, St. Louis, Mo., a general supply depot, which, on my own suggestion, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I am informed by those better advised than I am that the reference was a mistake and that the bill should have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7937) granting an increase of pension to Ira S. Bier (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 7938) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one cannon, with its carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Biddeford, Me.; and

A bill (S. 7939) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one cannon, with its carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Saco, Me.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 7940) granting an increase of pension to Mark P. Morton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7941) granting an increase of pension to Rufus Reynolds (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7942) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Davis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 7943) to provide for the promotion of Americanization of immigrants through education, and to appropriate money therefor; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 7944) granting an increase of pension to Corydom M. Turnbull (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD:

A bill (S. 7945) to investigate the condition of Indians living in Louisiana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 7946) for the relief of Albert Tate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 7947) granting a pension to James Nethers; and

A bill (S. 7948) granting an increase of pension to Jules Toffier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUSTING:

A bill (S. 7949) to provide for the erection of an addition to the Federal Building in the city of Janesville, county of Rock, and State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 7950) granting an increase of pension to John F. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 7951) granting a pension to Edward Fraher and Catherine Fraher, minor children of Joseph M. Fraher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 7952) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 7953) granting an increase of pension to Tulula V. M. Bortsfeld (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7954) granting an increase of pension to John T. Quinby (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7955) granting an increase of pension to Henry Barber (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7956) granting a pension to Lydia M. Smith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7957) granting a pension to Allen N. Bundy (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7958) granting a pension to Daniel Donohoe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 7959) granting an increase of pension to Albert P. Ramsey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7960) granting an increase of pension to Mitchell Larock (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 7961) granting a pension to James W. McKay (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 7962) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated; to the Committee on Public Lands.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1695) to provide for the military and naval training of the citizen forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

ADJUDICATION OF PRIVATE CLAIMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6918) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2215) to provide divisions of mental hygiene and rural sanitation in the United States Public Health Service, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT FOR PORTO RICO.

Mr. BROUSSARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment providing that hereafter every railroad company carrying the mails shall carry on any train it operates and without extra charge therefor the persons in charge of the mails, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19410), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TOWNSEND submitted an amendment providing in the clause relative to the employment on holidays of special clerks in first and second class post offices being allowed compensatory time on one of the 30 days next following the holiday on which they perform such service other employees shall be included, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19410), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STONE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain agricultural and horticultural experimental stations in the Central West, to be located in the principal grape growing States of Missouri, Ohio, Arkansas, and Michigan, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 19359), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for biophysical investigations under the Bureau of Plant Industry, Agricultural Department, from \$32,500 to \$35,500, of which amount \$3,000 is to be used for the purpose of investigating root-rot disease of fruit trees, alfalfa, and cotton in the Salt River and Yuma Valleys, in the State of Arizona, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 19359), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 for the enlargement of the cottonseed breeding station at Greenville, Tex., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 19359), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

THE ST. JOHN RIVER.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 325), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate the report of the International Commission pertaining to the St. John River.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, in accordance with Rule XL of the Senate Rules, I hereby give notice that on tomorrow I will propose that paragraph 3, of Rule XXXVIII, of the Rules of the Senate, be amended so that it shall read as follows:

3. All proceedings of the Senate when acting upon nominations shall be in open executive session, except when the Senate by a majority vote shall otherwise decide. Upon a motion for a secret executive session upon any nomination, each Senator shall be entitled to speak once and for five minutes only. If the Senate decides that any nomination should be considered in secret session, then all information communicated to or remarks made by a Senator when acting upon such nomination concerning the character or qualifications of the person nominated, also all votes upon such nomination; shall be kept secret. If in any case charges shall be made against a person nominated, the committee may in its discretion notify such nominee thereof, but the name of the person making such charges shall not be disclosed. The fact that a nomination has been made, or that it has been confirmed or rejected, shall not be regarded as a secret.

REPORT ON SUBMARINE BATTERIES.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, on January 2 a report was received from the Secretary of the Navy in reply to a resolution which I offered as to the publication of a report concerning the blowing up of some of our submarines, and it was ordered printed (S. Doc. No. 651) and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I understand that the Secretary of the Navy, in his testimony before the Committee on Naval Affairs, has given the information I sought to obtain. I think it would be a useless expense to print the matter which the Secretary has sent to the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the reference and the order to print. I do this simply to save the Government the expense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. BRANDEGEE. Now, I ask that the matter be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs without printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That order will be made.

GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 182, relative to a Government exhibit in the District of Columbia, and for which I asked consideration the other day. I feel that the joint resolution can be amended in such terms as will relieve it of any possible objection. It provides for an exhibit in the District of Columbia covering the time between February 26 and March 4, during the inaugural proceedings. The purpose is both laudable and commendable, and I feel that no Senator will now object to the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. The original joint resolution of the Senator from New Jersey is now on the calendar, and he asks unanimous consent for its present consideration?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes; I have asked for the present consideration of the joint resolution heretofore introduced by me, and, if that request is granted, then I shall offer some amendments.

Mr. GALLINGER. There can be no objection to the amendments which the Senator has, and I hope unanimous consent will be granted for the consideration and passage of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think the amendments which the Senator from New Jersey intends to propose to the joint resolution should be first read before unanimous consent is given for its consideration.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On line 3, after the word "That," it is proposed to strike out "Congress approves the suggestion of the Federation of Citizens' Associations, representing a majority of the citizens' associations of the District of Columbia, that it extend, on behalf of the residents of the District of Columbia, an invitation to the people of the United States to visit Washington during the week of February 26 to March 4, 1917, in order that they may become better acquainted with the Capital of the Nation and the operations of the Federal Government, and"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "establishments," to insert "in Washington"; and, in the same line, after the word "exhibit," to insert "from February 26 to March 10, 1917," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That authority is hereby granted to the executive departments and various Government establishments in Washington to exhibit from February 26 to March 10, 1917, such activities and methods of transacting business as can be done without detriment to the public service, with the object of presenting an educational symposium that will be of practical benefit to the people of the country.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I will say that I asked unanimous consent for the passage of this resolution as proposed to be amended, because it provides for the appropriation of no money. The various Government departments in this city, the clerks, and the citizens are most zealous in their efforts, and this will facilitate the work. They very earnestly desire that the joint resolution may be passed, and I trust that it may now be considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from New Jersey does not ask that the joint resolution shall be passed this morning, does he?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes. I should like to have the joint resolution immediately considered and passed, owing to the fact that the time for carrying it into effect is exceedingly short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], which have been read.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution authorizing an exhibition of the various activities of the Government service."

RETIREMENT OF FEDERAL JUDGES.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I have a brief argument prepared by Judge Walter Evans, of the district court of Kentucky, upon Senate bill 706, with reference to the constitutional features of that proposed legislation, which I think is

exceedingly valuable. I ask that it may be printed as a Senate document. I understand that the Printing Committee have some sort of an understanding that all such communications must be referred to that committee. I wish that it might be waived in this instance, because this is a bill which is pending before the House, and I should like very much to have the matter printed, so that it may be available while the bill is under consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to my colleague that I would much prefer to have it go to the committee. The committee can act upon it within the next day at least.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolutions:

On January 18, 1917:

S. 6864. An act providing for the continuance of the Osage Indian School, Oklahoma, for a period of one year from January 1, 1917.

On January 19, 1917:

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River; and

S. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy which will occur March 1, 1917, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 18994. An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of certain public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for certain public buildings; to abolish the Office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury and to create and organize in the Treasury Department a bureau of public buildings and define its duties, powers, and jurisdiction; to create and establish the office of commissioner of public buildings; to fix the salary and prescribe the duties and powers of the said commissioner of public buildings; to create a board of estimates and prescribe its duties and powers; to provide for the standardization of certain classes of public buildings, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If there be none, morning business is closed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the committee amendment on page 143, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. On page 143 the Committee on Appropriations reported to strike out lines 1, 2, and 3, as follows:

To investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially investigate the questions of infant mortality, \$72,120.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, on Friday, when the appropriation for the Children's Bureau was under discussion, I called attention to the work that had been done heretofore in the Labor Department—the Bureau of Labor it was then, but now the Department of Labor—in gathering together information with respect to the condition of the children of the country. I was a little bit confused in my own mind at that time as to the second organization that had been doing work of that kind—one of them public in its nature and the other a private organization that, I think, is supported by charity. I want now to call attention to the reports that were made by this Labor Bureau. Those reports consist of 19 volumes, and go into the minutest details of the question of the condition of women and children as laborers. As showing the nature of the work that is to be done, I call attention to a letter written by Mr. Nagel,

then Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting this report. He says:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington June 14, 1910.

Hon. JAMES S. SHERMAN,
President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In partial compliance with the Senate resolution of May 25, 1910, I beg to transmit herewith a report showing the results of the investigation into the condition of woman and child wage earners in the cotton textile industry in the United States.

This report has just been completed, and is the first section available for transmission of the larger report on the investigation carried on in accordance with the act of Congress approved January 29, 1907, which provided "That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate and report on the industrial, social, moral, educational, and physical condition of woman and child workers in the United States wherever employed, with special reference to their age, hours of labor, term of employment, health, illiteracy, sanitary and other conditions surrounding their occupation, and the means employed for the protection of their health, person, and morals."

A separate section, dealing with certain health conditions of cotton-mill operatives, together with the remaining sections of the general report, are being completed as rapidly as possible, and will each be transmitted at the earliest practicable moment.

Respectfully,

CHARLES NAGEL,
Secretary.

This volume of the report is confined to "Condition of woman and child wage earners in the United States in the cotton-textile industry." It contains 1,044 pages of closely printed matter. The entire series when completed constituted 19 volumes, I assume, of similar or equal size. So that we have about 19,000 pages of printed matter giving the facts in detail

and data relating to the important subject involved in the investigation. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] inquires the date of this report. It was transmitted to Congress June 14, 1910.

So that we have a very careful investigation of this subject so far as it relates to women and children engaged in labor. It does not extend necessarily to the babies who were too young to perform labor, but it practically covers all of the questions that would affect the condition and interest of little children as well as those who were old enough to work.

Mr. President, I had occasion to look into the question so far as it relates to the District of Columbia as a member of a joint committee of the two Houses that was appointed for the purpose of investigating the relations between the District of Columbia and the National Government. At that time I called upon the head of the health service here in the District to give me his views on the subject, and had a very interesting report from him that I called for individually in the preparation of a report that I was making at the time covering some of the things that I thought needed correction in the District of Columbia. Amongst other things, he furnished me with a table showing the population, deaths, and death rate in the District of Columbia by race and by calendar years from 1861 to 1914, inclusive. This showed a very careful investigation of these particular matters and it effected precisely what it is intended to be covered by this appropriation. I ask, without reading it, to include this table as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The table referred to is as follows:

Table showing the population, deaths, and death rates in the District of Columbia, by race and by calendar years, from 1861 to 1914, inclusive.

Years.	Population.			Deaths.			Death rate per 1,000.		
	White.	Colored.	Total.	White.	Colored.	Total.	White.	Colored.	Total.
1881-1885 ¹	129,375	65,161	194,536	2,430	2,191	4,621	18.78	33.63	23.75
1886-1890 ¹	147,899	73,257	221,156	2,707	2,362	5,069	18.30	32.24	22.92
1891-1895 ¹	176,619	85,034	261,653	3,392	2,665	6,057	19.21	31.34	23.15
1896-1900 ¹	194,517	89,272	283,789	3,238	2,573	5,811	16.65	28.82	20.48
1901-1905 ¹	217,606	93,719	311,325	3,395	2,647	6,042	15.60	28.20	19.41
1906-1910 ¹	240,244	96,696	336,940	3,626	2,678	6,304	15.09	27.69	18.71
1911.....	251,409	98,159	349,568	3,739	2,564	6,303	14.87	26.12	18.03
1912.....	254,260	98,676	352,936	3,606	2,653	6,259	14.18	26.89	17.73
1913.....	255,153	98,144	353,297	3,568	2,438	6,006	13.98	24.84	16.99
1914.....	256,049	97,615	353,664	3,493	2,373	5,866	13.64	24.31	16.59

¹ Average for 5-year period.

Mr. WORKS. Then in that same report was this statement with respect to the prevention of infant mortality:

PREVENTION OF INFANT MORTALITY.

Next to the prevention of tuberculosis the prevention of infant mortality has appealed to the popular mind and has been supported by private philanthropy. Up to the limit of its resources this has been done in this District. But the number of wealthy persons in the District who are able to support such a movement is small, and the number of those who are both able and willing to do so is even less.

The establishment of such infant-welfare stations as may be necessary to safeguard the health of the babies of the community would seem to be just as much a function of the Government as is any other action toward the conservation and promotion of health. What has been done by private philanthropy in this city is only the beginning of what should be done toward seeing that babies are well born and well cared for. These results are to be accomplished not so much by charity as by education, and to effect such education the infant-welfare station is but an incident. If the justification be needed for action by the District

government to save the babes, it can be found in the fact that the Government of the United States has deemed it a proper exercise of its powers to establish the Children's Bureau in the Department of Labor for the protection of the children of the Nation, even though the authority and power, with respect to the children, of the Nation generally is small as compared with the authority and power of the Government with respect to the children in this District.

The following statement shows the diminution that has occurred in the District since 1895, and this may be accepted as an indication of what may be accomplished in the future if a movement toward that end be properly organized and supported.

Then follows another table, showing the reduction in the death rate of children, which I also ask to include in my remarks without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

Showing deaths and death rates of infants under 1 year of age in the District of Columbia, by race and by years, from 1896 to 1914, inclusive.

[NOTE.—Birth returns prior to 1906 were too incomplete to afford a safe basis for the computation of death rates, at least for purposes of comparison.]

Years.	White.			Colored.			All.		
	Births.	Deaths under 1 year.	Deaths per 1,000 reported births.	Births.	Deaths under 1 year.	Deaths per 1,000 reported births.	Births.	Deaths under 1 year.	Deaths per 1,000 reported births.
1896-1900 ¹	2,798	594	1,871	732	4,669	1,326
1901-1905 ¹	3,429	515	1,980	650	5,409	1,165
1906-1910 ¹	4,632	522	113	2,268	592	261	6,900	1,114	161
1911.....	4,772	490	103	2,260	467	207	7,032	957	136
1912.....	4,734	427	90	2,273	472	208	7,007	899	128
1913.....	4,667	400	86	2,236	428	191	6,903	828	120
1914.....	4,925	343	70	2,205	372	169	7,130	715	100

¹ Annual average for 5-year period.

Mr. WORKS. In the prosecution of my portion of the work on that committee I prepared a somewhat lengthy report covering a number of subjects, one of them relating to the condition

of what I call the "slums" of Washington, but which are generally more politely called the inhabited alleys and closed courts. I am not going to take up time in reading any portion of it or

in commenting upon it, as I have done that once before in support of an appropriation that I asked for for that purpose, but I ask that it may be printed in my remarks also.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE SLUMS.

The American people want their Capital to be clean, decent, respectable, and healthful as well as beautiful on the outside. It has fallen far below this standard under a system of government where Congress can shift its responsibility onto the District of Columbia, a spineless and irresponsible municipal body. Under this system the slums, the red-light district, and saloons, and unwholesome and insanitary conditions have been allowed to flourish. Crime, vice, corruption, and death have devastated portions of the city that could and should have been protected from such conditions. From time to time feeble and ineffectual efforts have been made through inadequate laws to remedy these evils. The better class of people in the District have done the best they could with the insufficient weapons provided them by Congress to ameliorate the conditions and protect the poor people who suffer from them the most, but to a discouraging degree it has been a hopeless task. It is not wholly the fault of the people of the District that these conditions continue down to the present day. Neither is it the fault of the District officers. The chief reason for it is that Congress has failed to enact the laws and appropriate the money necessary to abate these crying evils, though often urged to do so.

In his message to the Fifty-ninth Congress President Roosevelt said: "The National Government has control of the District of Columbia and should see to it that the city of Washington is made a model city in all respects, both as regards parks, public playgrounds, proper regulation of the system of housing, so as to do away with the evils of alley tenements, a proper system of education, a proper handling of dealing with truancy and juvenile offenders, a proper handling of the charitable work of the District. Moreover, there should be proper factory laws to prevent all abuses in the employment of women and children in the District."

Pursuant to this recommendation the President appointed James Bronson Reynolds, of New York, to investigate conditions in the District and report to him with such recommendations as suggested themselves to him. In his letter asking Mr. Reynolds to act as adviser in the matter, he said:

"I wish your investigation to terminate in definite, practical recommendations to me with reference to the city's present needs and most notable defects, measured by the highest standards of good administration in this country and elsewhere."

I shall call attention to Mr. Reynolds's report and recommendations a little later. President Taft, dealing with this subject in his message to Congress of December 6, 1910, has this to say:

"Fair as Washington seems, with her beautiful streets and shade trees, and free, as the expanse of territory which she occupies would seem to make her, from slums and insanitary congestion of population, there are centers in the interior of squares where the very poor, and the criminal classes as well, huddle together in filth and noisome surroundings, and it is of primary importance that these nuclei of disease and suffering and vice should be removed and that there should be substituted for them small parks as breathing spaces and model tenements, having sufficient air space and meeting other hygienic requirements. The estimate for the reform of Willow Tree Alley, the worst of these places in the city, is the beginning of a movement that ought to attract the earnest attention and support of Congress, for Congress can not escape its responsibility for the existence of these human pestholes."

In pursuance of recommendations made by Mr. Reynolds, President Roosevelt appointed a commission of 15 of the leading citizens of Washington to deal with the subject.

That commission made a full and exhaustive report of conditions with its recommendations. This report first quoted from Mr. Reynolds's report as follows:

"The report of Mr. James Bronson Reynolds, referred to in the President's letter as the basis of his action, is as follows:

"REPORT OF THE HOUSING OF THE POOR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ESPECIALLY IN RELATION TO INSIDE TENEMENTS.

"As you directed me to give particular attention to the housing problem, I visited and examined between 350 and 400 tenements, shacks, and small houses in various sections of Washington and Georgetown and inspected numerous alleys. I talked with their occupants and conferred with many citizens of the District, both white and colored, including representatives of trade-unions, to obtain their views regarding housing conditions.

"In my investigation I found three distinct problems—that of small houses, that of alley shacks and alley houses, and that of inside alleys.

"I found nearly all the alley wooden shacks and small brick houses that I visited in a wretched condition. The wooden shacks, as a rule, might properly be condemned on structural grounds. Their yards were apparently storage places for refuse and filth; their water supply inadequate and badly placed, and the privies frequently only open boxes and in many instances without covers, although the latter are required by the health ordinance. I am glad to state that during the past year many of these box privies have been removed.

"I had conversation with the dwellers in these inside shacks, and the comments of many may be fairly summarized in the pathetic remark of an old colored woman who exclaimed, with reference to her neglected, filthy yard and privy: "Why, my old marsa wouldn't ha' kep' his horses stabled in such a place."

"No argument is needed to show that such ill-conditioned hovels are culture beds of disease, the germs of which may be carried far and wide by the flies which feed on the rotting garbage and excreta. Their number should be promptly ascertained and immediate steps taken for their complete elimination, and buildings constructed in their places should have proper sanitary appurtenances and should open either upon a highway or small street.

"A particularly undesirable and menacing feature of the poor quarters of Washington is the inside alleys. These alleys are centers of disorder and crime, and they make possible the continuance of small communities uncontrolled by ordinary police inspection and unaffected by public observation and criticism. In my opinion all inside alleys, with the exception of service alleys, should be abolished, and a definite scheme for the accomplishment of this object should be adopted.

"A law passed by the Congress in 1906 appropriated \$50,000 for the expense of condemnation proceedings in the substitution of minor streets for alleys, but a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia has interposed fresh difficulties by declaring unconstitutional the assumption of the law that the entire cost of opening small streets as substitutes for alleys should be assessed upon the adjacent property owners. I am not prepared to make any specific recommendations to meet this new difficulty, but to urge that it be not allowed to prevent the abolition of inside alleys."

The commission then proceeded to report the result of its own investigations, make recommendations, and point out the obstacles that prevented effective work, including reports of its subcommittees. From this long and exhaustive report I extract the following:

"A SERIOUS OBSTACLE TO THE CONVERSION OF ALLEYS INTO STREETS.

"The law passed July 22, 1892, and amended on August 24, 1894, prohibited the erection of dwellings in alleys less than 30 feet wide, and imposed restrictions which hindered the building of any more alley houses. It also provided for the conversion of alleys into minor streets, but nothing of importance seems to have been done under this law until the committee on improvement of housing conditions took the matter up a year or more ago with a demand that the change be made in certain typical alleys. This led the commissioners to appoint a committee of District officials to advise them as to the opening of minor streets, and cases were taken up as rapidly as they could be properly handled until, up to the present time, the opening of 12 such streets has been recommended. Two of these have been confirmed by the courts and three other cases are pending in court. The commissioners are proceeding as rapidly as possible in the other cases, but the conflict with private interests led to litigation and a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States on March 11 last, which declared it illegal to assess all the damages on certain property, as the law provides, unless it is found to be benefited to that extent. Although the commissioners are continuing to prepare and present cases they can not, under the law, approve the verdict in any case unless the benefits as assessed equal the damages and expenses.

"Mr. Thompson, in his Housing Handbook, says of private enterprise:

"It has been assumed by thousands who ought to have known better that private enterprise, unstimulated, unregulated, unassisted, undirected, has hopelessly failed. It has left us face to face with a very deficient supply; it has given us the old slums; it often has given us only acres and acres of new slums in the suburbs, jerry-built "brick boxes with slate lids" dumped down on dust heaps and put up mainly with the object of getting a quick profit in the few years which will elapse before they degenerate into slum dwellings almost as bad as the old ones in our midst. Where the new houses are well built and on good sites they are of an unsuitable type, and the rents are so unreasonably high as to be beyond the means of one family, so they have to be sublet to other families, and thus by overcrowding, with the increased wear and tear following in its train, they rapidly deteriorate and leave the housing of the mass of the people as bad in many respects as it was before. The product of private enterprise, then, is insufficient in quantity and inferior in quality.

"In the report of the health officer for 1875 it was noted that during the year 699 houses were reported as unfit for human habitation and 198 condemned by the board. In 1876 424 houses were reported and 371 condemned, and in the report of the board of health for 1877, page 46, we find:

"No meaner cabins for temporary or permanent shelter can be found than some our wretched poor are born and exist and die in here at the Capital of the United States. And, strange as it may seem, none so mean that they have not an owner mean enough to charge rent for them. Down in the alleys, below grade, with combination roof of tar, felt, shingles, rags, tin, gravel, boards, and holes; floors damp and broken, walls begrimed by smoke and age, so domiciled are families, with all the dignity of tenants having rent to pay. The board has condemned 153 such during the past year and 958 during the past four years, of which probably 800 have been entirely demolished. But many owners still cling to the wrecks.

"Our experience in dealing with filth, crowd poison, and disease among these people during the past four years has taught us that the great public enemy, viz, the preservation of public health, is defeated by allowing these filthy, worthless, dependent classes of humanity to congregate in the alleys and byways out of sight, and therefore out of mind, until direful epidemic, incubated and nourished among them, spreads its black wings over the homes of the whole city. Better far to provide for the aged and sick in public institutions of charity, the vagrant in the chain gangs, let the cost be what it may, than to allow them to remain propagators of public disease, an incalculable expense to the District."

This report was made at the close of the year 1908.

In April, 1903, the Washington Post said, editorially:

WE HAVE SLUMS OF OUR OWN.

"An English gentleman, who is also a philanthropist and a student of sociology, has been looking into the slums of Washington. Ten years ago he visited the Capital, but on that occasion saw only our splendid public parks and beautiful private residences, just like a very large majority of Washingtonians and visitors. He returned to England convinced that Washington was the long-looked-for model city. Now he pays a second visit, and this time he goes behind the scenes. The result of the investigation is an amendment to the gentleman's original estimate. He finds that while our areas of squalor and degradation are not as numerous or so extensive as those of London they are in many instances much more appalling. On this point he says:

"This time I came to see the worst that was to be seen, and it has been a revelation to me. I have seen rooms with half a dozen or more people living in them. I have seen buildings that would be condemned and torn down in London if they were inhabited only by a coster's donkey. Walls tumbling down, floors rotten, ceilings and walls falling in, little yards and outbuildings filled with rubbish and dirt, and absence of all sanitary arrangements. Within a stone's throw of the British Embassy, in an alley, there are hovels that are not fit for pigs to live in. Within the shadow of the Capitol there are others. On Factory Hill and in the holes around the canal in Georgetown there are frightful places full of filth and the direst poverty, where disease and crime must breed rapidly."

In December of that year Jacob Riis, in an address delivered at the First Congregational Church of Washington City, had this to say on the subject:

"I am not easily discouraged. But I confess I was surprised by the sights I have seen in the National Capital. You people of Washington

have alley after alley filled with people you know nothing about. There are 298 such alleys. They tell me the death rate among the negro babies born in these alleys is 457 out of 1,000 and before they grow up to be 1 year old. Nearly one-half. Nowhere I have ever been in the civilized world have I heard of a death rate like that. Why, I have never seen places like those you have here.

"To fight your slums you ought first of all to acquire the right to deal with the evil man who insists on murdering your babies. But you are sure to run against the old cry of 'property rights.' One-half your children die in hovels before they reach the age of 1 year, because the owners would rather have 25 per cent profit than save their souls. For such a condition there's no defense. Where does the blame lie? With the owners of the slums, you will probably say. But it lies equally with the community which permits such a shameful and sinful condition of affairs to exist within its borders."

In commenting on this address the Washington Times said: "This indictment of a community which has no slums, this astounding disclosure of a condition not paralleled by the squalor of New York or London or Paris, was the key last night to one of the most remarkable meetings held in Washington in many years. It was the judgment of a trained mind delivered after a trip through the Capital and expressed with manly courage and plain speech to an assembly of representative Washingtonians."

Under a more recent date the Times, in an extended editorial on slum conditions, said:

"The thing needed here is such an education of the commercial instinct that owners of houses in the poorer neighborhoods will cease to expect extraordinary percentages on their investments. It has been proved by investigation that the poor can be comfortably housed in clean, sanitary dwellings which will pay from 7 to 10 per cent on the investment if well managed. It has also been ascertained that the profits on much of the old-fashioned tenement and shanty property ran from 10 to 20 per cent, and even higher. This means that a few property owners are content to make money at the cost of the poor and at the risk of endangering the whole community through the disease and filth bred in their property. The way in which this kind of piracy can be avoided lies, first, in strictly enforced laws which will prevent overcrowding and insanitary buildings absolutely."

Now let us see how far the conditions have improved since that time. During the year 1910 strenuous efforts were made to secure needed legislation and thus improve conditions which were fully disclosed at that time. Let me quote some of the things that were said of conditions as they then existed.

In an article in the Washington Times we find the following, quoting in part from remarks of Mr. E. W. Oyster, one of the good citizens here, who has labored incessantly for better conditions in the District:

"Washington is honeycombed with filthy alleys, spreading disease in even the most beautiful parts of the city. Scattered through every residence section are slums more objectionable than the congested districts of New York or London. The health department is fighting a desperate losing battle against conditions too deep rooted to be repaired without public aid."

"This was the warning that E. W. Oyster, of the Petworth Citizens' Association, hurled from the pulpit of the People's Church, East Capitol Street, yesterday morning."

"The people who own property in these slums," said Mr. Oyster, "are selling their souls for cash. And the tragedy of it is they are selling the lives of their own carefully guarded children for cash."

"I shall not criticize the health department, because I believe Dr. Woodward is an efficient officer, alive to the situation but terribly handicapped."

"The public is strangely indifferent. As a special examiner of the Pension Bureau I have had occasion to visit these places, and if the public could see them as I have seen them, and as Dr. Woodward and his assistants have seen them, there would be a clamor for reform."

"We are spending millions making Washington beautiful, and it is beautiful; but what is beauty when it is rotten to the core?"

"As it is, the Capital of the Nation is a disgrace, with a death rate higher than even such cities as Denver, where we send our sick people too late to get them well."

"Behind the great mansions lay hovels that are natural disease breeders. In every part of this city, in the northwest as well as the southeast, citizens are being murdered through their own lack of interest and their own ignorance of what is going on behind their backs."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] in a statement made by him, as published in the Washington Times of September 21, 1914, has this to say:

"To those familiar with the alley conditions in the city of Washington no action in relation to the city's needs has been more imperative needed than their elimination. If the good men and women knew of the actual conditions that exist within the shadow of the Nation's Capitol and realized the dangers to health and good morals that go out from them to all parts of the city the demand for their eradication would be universal, except from those who profit from conditions that are a disgrace to civilization and Christianity. There would be no grumbling about how to do it, nor would the rights of humanity be sacrificed for the rights of property."

"When the situation is understood there is not much basis except greed for opposition to what has been done. No substantial injury will be suffered by anyone. Any dwelling house lawfully on these alleys now has been there more than 20 years. The real annual profits from this property have been from 10 to 14 per cent, and so the owners have been paid for it more than twice over during that time. No property is confiscated. All these owners have to do is to change the use of their property or the conditions of use."

"If they make the alleys conform to the conditions of the law they can use their property for homes or business as they do to-day. They may be put to some expense; their excessive profits may be reduced; but their property will still be useful and profitable."

"Nothing more strikingly illustrates the power and influence of wealth and greed than the situation is regard to this alley problem. The public has been apathetic, business organizations composed of men of high standing have opposed this legislation unless the so-called rights of property owners are given the last farthing of protection, and the public health and safety and the pleadings of humanity have been subordinated to the financial interests or a few rapacious individuals."

"A few noble women interested themselves in the subject. They did splendid work, but it took the pleadings of a tender-hearted woman in an exalted place as she passed into the Valley of Death to bring action. Action has come, swift, sure, direct, complete, and the city of Washington without its slums and unspeakable alley conditions will be a fitting tribute and monument to the sweet nobility of Mrs. Wilson, who, from her exalted place as the first lady of the land, gave her time,

strength, influence, and love for the happiness and comfort of the poor, lowly, and unfortunate, and whose last thoughts were not of her position, but of poor, suffering humanity."

In a circular published by the Monday Evening Club of Washington, in October, 1912, Thomas Jesse Jones, chairman of the housing committee of that club, has this to say:

"After 40 years of agitation and search for ways and means to eliminate the blind alleys of Washington, they still remain to spread crime and disease throughout the beautiful city and its inhabitants. Two startling facts should have swept these alleys out of existence years ago. One out of every three children born in these byways dies within the first year of life. To make matters worse, these houses with their diseases and crime, fill the center of many blocks rimmed with splendid houses and hotels."

"A glance at the map of Washington shows the dangerous proximity of these disease centers to the best residential blocks of the city."

"Some alleys have been eliminated to meet the demands of commercial enterprises. One disreputable place was converted into a minor street by assessments upon neighboring property equal to the cost involved in the change. Further application of this method was stopped by a Supreme Court decision in 1907 which cast doubt upon the legality of this form of assessment. At the last session of Congress \$78,000 were voted for the change of the most notorious alley in the city into an inner park. This year the commissioners are planning to attack four more alleys."

"But, in spite of all these accomplishments and plans, there is no plan to attack the problem as a whole. A careful study of the whole situation leads to the conclusion that the final solution of the alley problem awaits the aroused public interest of the Nation. Let us add to our plans for a city beautiful a demand for a city pure. Let the woman's clubs of the land, the civic associations of the Nation, and political organizations of every State and city unite in the call for a National Capital that shall be both beautiful without and clean within."

In the same circular Mr. Wilbur Vincent Mallaleu says:

"The moral conditions in such a secluded inclosure as this court can scarcely be imagined. The police who have to do with it agree in speaking of its disreputable character. One officer has remarked that it is the worst place in the United States and that there is no crime unknown to it. The police blotter of the precinct shows that from March 1, 1911, to March 1, 1912, there were 114 arrests among the 204 men, women, and children living in Snows Court. The charges were drunkenness, disorderly conduct, assault, unlawful assembly, larceny, cruelty to animals, and accusations relating to sexual crimes. Nor does this number of cases represent all the evil, because it does not take into account residents of Snows Court arrested in other precincts, nor does it include the mischief done in Snows Court by inhabitants of the neighboring alleys and residents of other parts of the city."

"Snows Court is a peril to our Capital's life. Only an awakened public conscience that shall demand the abolition of this and other pest centers will rid the city of very grave dangers."

I might go on almost without limit quoting from the sayings of newspapers and others as of that date condemning conditions and suggesting remedies, but I desist.

This showing should appeal strongly to Congress for relief. In a directory of the inhabited alleys, issued as late as 1912, it is said by way of introduction:

"There are 275 of these interior courts in the city. They contain 3,337 houses used for dwellings and approximately 16,000 persons. They are so widely distributed throughout the city that even the best residential sections are not free from their evil influences. The northwest, the largest of the four general sections of the city, has 161, or nearly three-fifths of all the alleys."

"The statement which follows shows the number of alleys and alley houses for each section of the city:

"Total, alleys, 275; houses, 3,337.
 "Northwest, alleys, 161; houses, 1,940.
 "Southwest, alleys, 58; houses, 705.
 "Northeast, alleys, 30; houses, 336.
 "Southeast, alleys, 26; houses, 356.
 "The average for each alley is 12.1 houses and 58.1 persons. Each alley house has an average of 4.8 persons."

Now, let us see what Congress has done to remedy or ameliorate these fearful conditions. In a pamphlet published by the committee on housing of the woman's welfare department of the National Civic Federation in November, 1912, it was recited:

"This first health board, which had begun its work of alley reclamation so nobly, was abolished and the office of health officer created by an act of Congress June 11, 1878. Right here the good work stopped, for in the legalization of the health ordinances in 1880, the section under which the health department acted in the condemnation of insanitary buildings was omitted. Whether this omission was an oversight or was secured by the influence of men whose money interests were at stake is not known, but it was 12 long years before any further remedial legislation was enacted and during those years no houses were condemned and new houses were constantly erected. Alley property had proved a paying investment and brick had succeeded wood as building material."

In 1892 an act was passed by Congress authorizing the commissioners to "condemn, open, extend, widen, or straighten alleys on the petition of the owners of more than one-half of the real estate in the square in which such alley is sought to be opened," etc.

Congress very magnanimously provided in this act that the whole of the expenses of such improvements should be assessed against the property owners in the square to be affected. By an act passed in 1894, the provisions of the act were extended to minor streets of a width of not less than 40 or more than 60 feet in width.

It goes without saying that these statutes amounted to practically nothing as a means of ridding the city of the evils I am considering.

By an act passed in 1906 a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings was created and authorized to investigate and destroy or repair such buildings. This has resulted in the destruction of some of the buildings in these alleys, but it has wholly failed to reach the heart of the evil and has accomplished very little of good in respect of the slum evil.

In 1914 an act was passed making it unlawful "to erect, place, or construct any dwelling on any lot or parcel of ground fronting on an alley where such alley is less than 30 feet wide throughout its entire length and which does not run straight to and open on two of the streets bordering on the square and is not supplied with sewer, water mains, and gas and electric light."

The intention of this act was good and it is good as far as it goes, but that is a very short distance. It only prevents the construction of

additional buildings in some of the alleys, which amounts to but little as a means of putting an end to evils that have existed for many years.

On March 3, 1915, another well-intentioned act was passed "to incorporate the Ellen Wilson Memorial Homes." This was a fitting memorial to a good woman whose generous and sympathetic heart went out in sympathy to the unfortunates who were denied the comforts of sanitary homes. But as a practical means of rendering the help she so much desired them to have, it will amount to nothing of permanent good. The work of correcting this great evil can not be delegated to private individuals. If it is ever done and done effectually it must be done by the Government and with its money, as I shall endeavor to point out further along.

There was one other act that was effective to destroy one of the worst of these slum alleys. It was the act to condemn Willow Tree Alley. In this instance the Government generously put up half of the money necessary to accomplish this commendable result. But even this beneficent effort has largely failed of its object because instead of opening out the alley to the sunlight and the public gaze it has been turned into an inside or inclosed park that has become the rendezvous of criminals, vagabonds, and the immoral and viciously disposed of the poorer classes that calls for police and sanitary inspection and control which is not always supplied.

In a report of the committee on improvement of existing houses and elimination of insanitary and alley houses of the President's Homes Commission, above mentioned, made December 8, 1908, some of the existing conditions are described and the difficulties of dealing with them effectually are pointed out.

For example, in speaking of one of the objectionable alleys it is said: "One of these cases is Blagden's Alley, square 368, concerning which the chief of police and his associates on the board states in the recommendation for its conversion into a minor street that—

"Blagden's Alley, located between Ninth and Tenth and M and N Streets, contains 54 houses inhabited by a negro element who live in poverty and are a source of constant trouble. The dwellings are insanitary and dilapidated and afford shelter to 10 or 12 persons each."

"Another is square 620, as to which the board reported:

"Logan Place contains 35 insanitary dwellings, which are very much overcrowded and the inhabitants, being of a vicious character, give the police more or less trouble."

"Everyone familiar with these and other such labyrinths realizes the security from police supervision which they afford, to say nothing of other disadvantages which fully justified the recommendation of the board."

Then it was said:

"The principal difficulty with the present law seemed to be that it required that an amount equal to the damages found should be assessed as benefits, and that this should be assessed within a limited area. It was found that the law of 1906 in relation to the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of streets provided that the jury should assess benefits not only upon adjoining and abutting property but upon any and all other lots, pieces, or parcels of land which the jury might find to be benefited by the improvement. This apparently indicated a plan by which the amounts required could be raised in a more equitable manner, but as it seemed probable that in many cases the damages awarded would even then exceed the benefits which the jury might find, it seemed desirable to include also a provision by which a certain proportion of the awards could, if necessary, be paid out of some general fund."

"One of the commissioners has suggested, when the Engineer Commissioner recommended that the work be stopped on account of the expense, that legislation might be urged providing that the alleys be opened and a certain proportion of the expense be paid by the United States Government, another proportion by the District government, and the remainder be assessed upon the property owners in the neighborhood of the improvement. Inasmuch as the deplorable conditions of the alleys have grown up under the administration of the District government, it seems proper that a considerable portion of the expense of removing them should be borne in this way by those responsible for them; but, as any payment for District purposes by the Federal Government would be contrary to the definite policy adopted by Congress, it did not seem advisable to the committee to advocate such a provision."

The picture presented by the quotations I have made is not overdrawn. They do not disclose the whole truth. I have not depended on such information in reaching conclusions. I have examined enough of these slums and inspected enough of the dwellings located in them to speak of my own knowledge. The conditions are unspeakably bad. One who witnesses them for the first time is filled with a profound sense of pity and commiseration for the inmates, not unmixed with a feeling of shame and resentment that a great Nation like this, one of the richest and most powerful in the world and possessed of almost unlimited resources, should allow such conditions to exist in its Capital City.

Washington is a city of striking and abrupt contrasts. One may ride along a wide, well-paved, and attractive street lined with beautiful, almost palatial, homes and turn from it upon an old, worn-out, cobblestone or brick paved street lined with old, broken-down houses, many of them dilapidated and apparently unfit for human habitation. From that one can turn into what are politely called "inhabited alleys," "courts," "places," and find an appalling condition of poverty, destitution, and degradation. All this within a distance of two or three squares. Some of these alleys are blind alleys—that is to say, there is but one means of ingress and egress—and within is a labyrinth of alleys covering the entire inside of a square with a fringe of houses around the outside, some of them little better than those within except that they are easier of access.

Within such a square you find the most degrading conditions. It is almost beyond belief that human beings can live under such conditions. They have very justly been called pestholes of crime and disease. And yet the owners of the shacks and tumbled-down and insanitary houses are making more money out of the rent of them than is being made by the owners of first-class houses and business blocks. The rents are exorbitantly high. As an example, I visited one little old brick shanty with two small rooms up and two down stairs, without running water in the house, out of repair, plaster off the walls, ill-lighted, and poorly ventilated. This house was occupied by two families, each with two rooms, for which they paid \$7 a month each, or \$14 for this little, dilapidated, insanitary house that should have been condemned and destroyed under existing laws long since.

There is but one effective remedy for this dreadful condition. The Government should condemn the whole square as a sanitary measure and police regulation, tear everything out of it, root and branch, replat the ground, construct upon it model sanitary houses, rent them to the

poorer classes of people who now inhabit the slums, and then supervise and inspect them, thus compelling the tenants to keep them in a sanitary condition inside as well as out. It will be said that all this will cost a lot of money. Yes; it will; but it will be money much better spent than are millions and millions of dollars that we are now throwing away for useless and illegal purposes.

The Agricultural Department is spending and wasting millions and millions of dollars on useless experiments and in work that should be done by the States and can not legitimately be done by the National Government. The Public Health Service is spending millions more in the States in violation of the spirit of the Constitution. We are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for the cure of hogs and cattle in the States often where the Federal authorities have no lawful right or business to enter. We spend millions for agricultural colleges and vocational schools in the States, a work that belongs to and should be left to the States. We are spending money lavishly, extravagantly, and paternally in the States. The dividing lines between the States and the Federal Government are fast disappearing by the raid of the States on the National Treasury. The States are selling their jurisdiction and their sovereignty for money. We are centralizing our Government at an alarming rate and to a degree that I am afraid few appreciate and for purely mercenary and selfish reasons. The pork barrel is kept well filled. We are spending millions of dollars for public buildings in the States that are not needed and for the improvement of so-called rivers and creeks that are of no public use. No wonder the National Treasury is bankrupt and the people are being taxed to keep up these many illegitimate and useless expenditures. But when an effort is made to clean up the National Capital, which is within the jurisdiction of the Government and for which it is directly responsible, the purse strings are tightly drawn and the cheese-paring begins. The half-and-half system is appealed to as a reason and excuse for economy. And if the half-and-half system is adhered to, it may just as well be conceded now, once for all, that this necessary improvement can not be accomplished. The one-half of the money necessary for the initial work can not be raised by taxation. It would be ruinous. And so long as the Government hides itself behind the half-and-half system and contents itself by meeting one-half of the expenses the conditions in the Capital will continue as they are now, a disgrace and a reproach to the Nation.

These are conditions that should not be allowed to exist for a day in any city in a civilized country, much less in the Capital of a great Nation like ours. But, it will be asked, What is the remedy? The remedy is simple and easy, but expensive. The Government should take the matter vigorously in hand. As I have said, it should condemn and clean out these alleys at whatever cost. But it should not stop when it has turned these poor people out of their homes, however poor and insanitary they are. It should provide other homes for them at reasonable rents, to be under the inspection and control of the Government. This could be done as a matter of public safety and as a sanitary measure. This duty of providing homes for the poor and incompetent within the Capital should not be left to private enterprises seeking profits. Neither the cost nor the responsibility should be divided with anybody. To assess the damages resulting from such sanitary improvements to private owners of property is entirely unreasonable and wholly unjust. Our civic pride as well as our sense of justice should impel us to act in this matter promptly and effectively. It has been done in other countries. It can and should be done in this country within its Capital, over which it has exclusive control.

Of the means resorted to in London, England, and its results, the report of the housing committee above referred to has this to say:

"The housing of the working classes act, which was passed in 1890 and which superseded and improved previous attempts in this connection, provided not only that individual houses might be condemned as insanitary, as is done under the law of 1906 here, but also that an area containing streets and many houses might be declared 'unhealthy' and taken over by the local authority; and that the buildings might be removed, the streets rearranged, and other dwellings erected, either by agencies to which money would be furnished by the local authority, or if necessary by the local authorities themselves. In fact, the law made it obligatory upon the local authority in London to provide housing accommodations for at least 50 per cent of the people displaced, which has since been raised by an amendment making the required provision equal to all, and in other districts to such an amount as might be determined by the local authority to be adequate under all the circumstances."

"Under this housing of the working classes act numerous wretched districts have been cleared up and comfortable and healthy dwellings provided, and although the cost to the community has been considerable in certain cases where the evils to be remedied were of long standing and very great, the law has done great good and the attention of those interested in the subject is being given to improving its operation than to changing it in any radical way. It aims, so far as possible, to protect the interest of the community in acquiring any property which has become detrimental to the well-being of the district, while at the same time dealing justly with the owners. The method of procedure requires the local authority to take the initiative, and where a loan is necessary, as it often is where an area is acquired, the plans for this and for the improvement of the area must be approved by the central authority in London."

And comparing the conditions there with ours, it is said further:

"It will be noticed that the situation in the District of Columbia is similar to that in England in that the District government resembles the local authority, which can take the initiative in regard to any alleys which require attention, but which can not act without the consent of an authority not local, which in the case of the district is Congress."

"The ordinary danger in giving to public officials who are in entire control considerable discretion in the disbursement of public funds is therefore removed, and it ought to be possible for Congress to give such a plan a fair trial without incurring any very great risk."

The following, published in the Trades Unionist, is worthy of careful consideration:

"That the United States Government should make Washington the model for all cities of the country was the opinion of the delegates to the National City Planning Conference, which met in this city on May 22, 1909. It was the consensus of opinion of the delegates to this conference that the working out of the plans for the beautification along practical lines rather than for mere adornment should be the ideal worked for by all American cities in order that all classes of people shall be benefited."

"One of the speakers at the opening session of the conference was Robert A. Pope, landscape architect, of New York City. He said:

"Of prime importance to the growth of the city-planning movement in America is the realization of its true nature, its proper aim, its vast

social and economic import. Because of ignorance of the true scope of city planning, work in this country has not and can not, as at present understood, accomplish its primary function.

"For example," he said, "we have assumed without question that the first object of city planning is to beautify. We have made the esthetic an objective in itself. We have rushed to plan showy civic centers of gigantic cost, the carrying out of which too often has been brought about by civic vanity, when pressing hard by we see the almost unbelievable congestion, with its hideous brood of evil, filth, disease, degeneracy, and crime. What external adornment can make truly beautiful such a city? Is it genuine foresight to neglect the present-day serious and fast-growing evils of congestion and bad housing, which is so directly a menace to future generations?"

"To forestall the disastrous and otherwise inevitable consequences of these conditions will be the richest service that city planning can accomplish for the future. That this is its true and primary function can be abundantly established. The example of European countries, especially that of Germany, demonstrates that wise city planning, with proper regulations, can alleviate and ultimately eradicate undue congestion, the festering source of most of our disease, crime, and degeneracy. To remedy congestion, then, is to help solve some of our most threatening social and economic problems."

"The foregoing statement in regard to city planning and city management are probably true of all cities and are certainly true of Washington."

"What external adornment can make truly beautiful such a city? The Washington Times appears to have anticipated Mr. Pope's question when it said editorially:

"No part of the greater Washington can be safely built upon a rotten foundation. There is no room in the city for such contrasts as foul alleyways and a parking system embracing the beauties of a paradise. The spirit that labors for the realization of the beautification project should at the same time strive for the elimination of the slum quarters."

"The Washington Post says our alleys are 'pest holes'; Rev. J. M. Waldron, president of the Alley Improvement Association, brands them as 'plague spots'; President Roosevelt declared them 'a reproach to the Capital City'; and Senator McMillan 'a disgrace to our civilization.'"

"What external adornment can make truly beautiful such a city?—a city honeycombed with disease-breeding, death-dealing, and crime-producing slums! Jacob Riis says they are worse than any he ever saw in New York City or in London, and Washington's death rate, when compared with that of the cities named and nearly all the other cities of its class in the United States and Europe seems to prove the truth of his statement."

If Congress will abolish the "local authority" here known as the District of Columbia, which is a mere incumbrance, and the half-and-half system and deal with this awful condition directly and with a free hand, the conditions can be eliminated from the life of the Capital as they should be.

There can be no possible excuse for them to remain. It is a shame to every American citizen that they have been allowed to exist at all.

Mr. WORKS. Now, Mr. President, the real question here is not whether this work ought to be done, but by whom it should be done, and whether it should be done by one department or bureau of the Government or by three or four separate and distinct departments or bureaus. My own opinion about it is that the best way to protect children is through sanitation; and that does not belong to the duties or obligations of the medical profession. If the Children's Bureau could be so organized with a sanitary force composed largely of sanitary engineers and experts along that line to do the work that is necessary to be done here in the District of Columbia for the purpose of bettering conditions, I should be glad to support a very liberal appropriation for that purpose; but if the Children's Bureau is simply going to make investigations on the outside, as it has done up to the present time, and publish pamphlets and data respecting conditions, I think it is almost a waste of money; and, as it is already being done by the Public Health Service and by the Department of Labor, and being carried on by charitable institutions very largely here in the District and elsewhere, it does not seem that there is any particular necessity for making appropriations of this kind for that purpose. What I should like to see done would be to confer all power on one of these bureaus, confine the work to that bureau, and furnish it with all the means necessary to do that work efficiently and promptly. I am inclined to think that, properly organized and conducted, there would be no better organization for that purpose than the Children's Bureau; but I should not want to appropriate money for that purpose until some such organization is provided for and means are then furnished to carry out efficiently what all of us believe ought to be done.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I can not permit this occasion to pass without expressing my earnest advocacy of the amendment increasing the appropriation for child-welfare work. The first obligation of civilization and government is to the child. Victor Hugo, friend of all mankind, furnished no greater illustration of devotion to humanity than his intense love of children. In his last great novel "Ninety-three," he gives us what is perhaps the most beautiful description of child life in literature. The scene is an old castle in the forest of La Vendee, the home of a French nobleman in the year 1793, one of the bloodiest years of the French Revolution. With the touch of a master Hugo pictures the three children of the nobleman, pursuing innocent delights within the castle, un-

aware of the war raging about them, of the relentless pursuit of their father by the revolutionists, of the destruction to which their habitation was doomed. Georgette, a baby girl of less than 2 years, leaves her cradle to chatter to a sunbeam, and Hugo utilizes the incident for the following tribute:

What a bird says in its song a child says in its prattle. It is the same hymn; a hymn indistinct, lisping, profound. The child has what the bird has not, the somber human destiny in front of it. Hence the sadness of men as they listen, mingling with the joy of the little one as it sings. The sublimest canticle to be heard on earth is the stammering of the human soul on the lips of infancy. That confused chirruping of a thought, that is as yet no more than indistinct, has in it one knows not what sort of artless appeal to the eternal justice; or is it a mute protest uttered on the threshold before entering in, a protest meek and poignant? This ignorance smiling at the Infinite compromises all creation in the lot that shall fall to the weak, defenseless being.

Let me repeat this last sentence:

This ignorance smiling at the Infinite compromises all creation in the lot that shall fall to the weak, defenseless being.

Mr. President, this sentence contains an indictment of society and government as just as it is terrible. Does the child die from preventable disease? Is it weakened or deformed through neglect, lack of knowledge, or lack of means to secure proper treatment? Some one must answer to the Almighty.

Go read the shameful records of infant mortality in this country of boasted enlightenment, of the deaths of mothers on the battle fields of maternity, battle fields where a sublimer valor is exhibited than in all the conflicts that are trumpeted by the tongue of history, and ask yourselves where the responsibility rests.

The creation of the Children's Bureau in 1912 was an effort on the part of the Federal Government to meet that responsibility, to the extent of its powers and facilities.

This bureau under the able leadership of Miss Lathrop has already brought to the public attention facts of appalling significance.

It has shown that in 1913 childbirth caused more deaths among the women of this country than any disease except tuberculosis; that although these deaths are largely preventable they are not diminishing, whereas the mortality due to typhoid fever was cut in half from 1900 to 1913, and the mortality due to tuberculosis was materially reduced; that of those who survived the ordeal of maternity untold thousands find their strength permanently wrecked, their health more or less impaired; that if this frightful condition is to be checked and remedied higher standards of care for women before, during, and after childbirth must be adopted.

It has made a careful survey of infant mortality in typical manufacturing towns, and it has established a definite relation between this mortality and low earnings. It found in one of the localities under investigation that of the babies with fathers earning less than \$450 per year one in four died before reaching the age of 12 months. Fathers earning less than \$450 per year amounted to 13.7 per cent of the wage-earning population in the industrial center under survey. It found that the greater number of babies had fathers in the wage group from \$450 to \$849 per annum, and that of these one in every six died before attaining the age of 12 months. It found that of the babies whose fathers earned \$850, but less than \$1,050, 1 in every 8 failed to live more than 12 months, and that where fathers earned \$1,050 or more only 1 in 16 died in the first year.

It found that where families composed of 2 or more persons occupied one room the infant mortality was twice as high as where there was less than 1 person per room; that babies living in houses occupied by a single family died at the rate of 86.1 per 1,000, while those in tenements occupied by more than 6 families died at the rate of 236.6 per 1,000; that when the mother was a wage earner the baby's chances of living were less than when she was not.

When this bureau was established in 1912 it was ordered to report on all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life. For the first two years it had a staff of 15 persons, and an appropriation of \$25,640 for each year. In 1914 the staff was increased to 76 persons, the annual appropriation to \$164,460.

Public interest has been aroused in the work of this bureau to such an extent that it finds the present force utterly inadequate. It asks for an increase of 57 persons for its staff, calling for an additional appropriation of \$187,520, the total requested being \$352,160.

The bureau's bulletins on the care of infants have met unqualified indorsement and popularity. Letters from grateful mothers have reached the bureau which more than vindicate the wisdom of Congress in creating this beneficent agency.

The bureau is indexing and assembling the laws relating to child welfare not only for its own guidance but for the guidance of the Government in administering the child-labor law.

In cooperation with the General Federation of Women's Clubs it has instituted a Nation-wide campaign for the closer study of infant mortality, having set aside a certain week known as baby week, during which the entire country is to devote especial attention to all phases of this fundamental problem. More than 2,000 communities took part in baby week in 1916, and a splendid awakening on this great subject was evident.

The bureau is making a skillful and careful study of defective children and of child mortality in the rural districts.

The increased force now asked for will be barely sufficient to enable the bureau to meet the public demand for information regarding the work already undertaken.

It is to me a matter of wonder that Senators hesitate to vote the remarkably small amount desired for this overwhelmingly important work. I would deem it an honor and a duty to vote millions for it, instead of a few hundred thousands.

If I could have my way, I would have the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, take whatever steps might be necessary to make certain the proper care of mother and of child in the supreme and holy crisis of maternity.

And this could be done with infinitely less than we expend each year for the terrible machinery of war.

It would be a measure of preparedness in the highest and most effective sense. Behind the machine stands the man. Behind the man stands the child.

Considering the sacredness and the value of the work, the amount desired is modest in the extreme. Including the requested increase, the total appropriation for this bureau will be less than 4 per cent of the cost of one first-class battleship.

It is not alone a question of expediency but of right. Every human being has an inalienable right to a normal birth. Every human being has an inalienable right to be born under sanitary and comfortable surroundings, under proper treatment and care. Every little life that perishes through lack of knowledge or neglect or finds a precarious survival within a feeble and defective body is an accusation of the Republic and an indictment of the flag.

I hope, therefore, that the amendment of the committee will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). The Senator from Iowa requests the yeas and nays on the amendment of the committee. Is the request seconded?

Mr. KENYON. Before that is done, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Hardwick	Overman	Smoot
Beckham	Hollis	Page	Sterling
Brady	Hughes	Phelan	Stone
Broussard	Husting	Pittman	Sutherland
Bryan	James	Polindexter	Swanson
Catron	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	Thomas
Clapp	Jones	Ransdell	Thompson
Clark	Kenyon	Reed	Tillman
Colt	Kern	Robinson	Vardaman
Culberson	La Follette	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lane	Sbaforth	Walsh
Curtis	McCumber	Sheppard	Warren
Dillingham	McLean	Sherman	Weeks
Fernald	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Williams
Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Works
Gallinger	Norris	Smith, S. C.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the committee amendment, on which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I can not but think, Mr. President, that the controversy which has arisen over this appropriation is the result of misunderstanding and misapprehension. I am loath to believe that any Member of the Senate would favor the reduction of the appropriation of any reasonable sum of money which could be expended by the Children's Bureau in the work which it was commissioned to do by the statute which created that bureau. I do not know of any way in which we can build so strongly into our national life as by an intelligent and scientific study of the child from birth.

Before the Children's Bureau was created investigations regarding the public health, industrial insurance, and other matters pertaining to the physical well-being of the people were made by other bureaus of the Government. But, in the wisdom of Congress it was determined, four years ago, that there was a field unoccupied where the Government could direct inquiry and investigation to the great advantage of the American people and of our Government. There seemed to be, Mr. President, unexplored territory. There seemed to be obscured and little understood facts which in the interest of the Government and

of our people should be thoroughly explored, and the Children's Bureau as the result of it all came into existence.

It was not hasty and ill-considered legislation. The subject had been widely discussed. Other Governments had pointed the way for us. So the Children's Bureau was created as the result of a solemn and deliberative congressional act to do a certain work necessary to the well-being of the American people.

Mr. President, that bureau has been engaged in the performance of the obligations and the duties imposed upon it by law for four years. It has never been in favor with the Appropriations Committee, either of the House or of the Senate. It was given at the outset an appropriation of \$25,000. After it had inaugurated its work it asked for an increase in the appropriation. The House committee declined to give it. The House of Representatives took the matter away from the committee and increased the appropriation according to the request made by this bureau, and that action was confirmed by this body. The bureau again and again has been denied increased appropriations by the committees of Congress, and these increased appropriations have been voted by the body, either of the House of Representatives or the Senate. That, to my mind, just as a Member of the Senate observing legislation and its trend and course, has a certain significance.

So I say the fact that the committee has reported a cut in this appropriation should carry with it very little prestige. It lacks the force that it would have if the committees of Congress had shown toward the Children's Bureau that consideration which the Congress itself has shown.

As a rule we are inclined, Mr. President, to accept the investigations of committees. The multiplicity of legislative subjects considered by Congress makes that somewhat necessary. But when again and again and again some branch of the Government seems to be in the disfavor of the committees which have charge of the appropriations, and these are cut and cut again and cut once again, and the action of the committees is reversed by the body that created the committee, then I think I am warranted in arguing that we are not bound blindly to follow the committee in such an instance.

Mr. President, the Senate is immediately concerned with the two reductions made in this bill as it passed the House of Representatives. Because they seem to have been considered in that order by the Senate in the course of its procedure upon this bill, I take the second one first and ask the attention of the Senate for a moment to it. On page 143 the House of Representatives, considering this paragraph which I shall read presently, granted to the Children's Bureau an appropriation for the purposes set forth of \$95,000. That amount is reduced by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, or the recommendation of that committee is for a reduction, from \$95,000 to \$58,000.

Now, what is the purpose to which this money would be applied? I ask the attention of Senators, because the reasons assigned by the committee for this reduction, I believe, are not sustained. I think the reasons assigned show a misapprehension of the purposes to which this expenditure was committed by the terms of the bill. I read from page 143:

For traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, of officers, special agents, and other employees of the Children's Bureau; employment of experts and temporary assistants, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$8 a day—

I am reading it as it passed the House. The Senate committee proposes an amendment to that reducing it to \$6 per day—

and of interpreters, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$4 a day when actually employed; purchase of reports and material for the publications of the Children's Bureau, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals, including the advance payment of subscriptions for the same, for newspaper clippings to enable the Children's Bureau to secure data regarding the progress of legislation affecting children and the activities of public and private organizations dealing with children, and for reprints from State, city, and private publications for distribution when said reprints can be procured more cheaply than they can be printed by the Government, \$95,000.

That is the amount the House voted the Children's Bureau for that purpose. That amount is reduced to \$58,000 by the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, Mr. President, I want to give to Senators the reasons assigned by this committee on the floor of the Senate for that reduction. When this item of the bill was first reached on January 18 the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURRIS] first took the floor in opposition to the reduction. The Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], a member of this committee, arose in his place to make an explanation. It will appear from the RECORD that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] at the same time had obtained recognition, and he said:

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator from Florida is going ahead, I will not take up the time; but it seems that the committee has placed the amounts just as they were last year. The amount last year for travel-

ing expenses, per diem, and so forth, was \$58,000. I doubt if they have calculated at all the reduction that will come from reducing the salaries to \$6 a day in getting at that result.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; the House committee did that. The House committee allowed a per diem of \$6, and the House raised it to \$8. That explains the difference between \$58,000 and \$95,000. The committee thought \$6 enough.

Mr. KENYON: Does that cover the whole difference in that item?

That is the reduction from \$95,000 to \$58,000. The Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] answered:

That is my understanding of it. The Senate committee put it back as the House committee reported it to the House, to have it in conference, after having read, however, the hearings before the House committee. My understanding is that that is what it is due to.

That is the reason a member of this committee furnishes to the Senate for making the reduction from \$95,000 to \$58,000—that it was based upon reducing the per diem pay of the field experts from \$8 to \$6.

Now, let us see what a poor understanding the committee had on that subject of the uses to which the \$95,000 by the terms of the bill were to be applied. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], apparently well understanding that a reduction of the per diem pay of those who were to go into the bill would not justify any such cut as that, in response to the statement made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], submitted this statement:

I do not understand how that could be, because the number of experts and temporary assistants to be employed under this section is optional with the bureau head, apparently. There is no stated number that could be employed.

Then the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations, replied:

Oh, well, of course; but then they stated before the committees how many people they had. That explains that item so far as I understand it.

That is, that the reduction of the per diem from \$8 to \$6 is the sole justification that this committee offers upon this floor for cutting this appropriation from \$95,000 to \$58,000.

Now, let us see what the fact is about the employment of these experts. There are 72 present members of the staff of the Children's Bureau, and of that number 27 are field agents. Of the 57 additional members to the staff asked for in the report of the head of this bureau and in the hearings before both committees 13 are to be field agents in addition to the 27 who are now field agents. Taking the report of the bureau as to the length of time employed by these field agents and the specific number, the reasons assigned by the committee through its member, the Senator from Florida, do not account in any measure for or justify the reduction of this item. I am going to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorandum which has been furnished me by Mr. A. J. McKelway and was prepared from information furnished by the department and open to anyone who may desire to secure it:

The debate on the subject of increasing the appropriation for the Children's Bureau, in accordance with the provision of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, indicates that the bureau has been more concerned with accomplishing its task than with informing Members of Congress concerning the real scope of its activities and its real usefulness to the country. There seems to be a considerable amount of misapprehension concerning the work of the bureau.

The Children's Bureau is charged by Congress with the duty of investigating and reporting upon all matters relating to children and child life in this Republic. It was given an initial appropriation of some \$25,000, and worked along with this until it was fully organized and its lines of service carefully and scientifically projected.

Two years ago the demand for its services from all parts of the country became so great that it asked Congress to increase its appropriation from \$25,000 to \$164,000. Under the rules of the House the increase in the statutory positions could be defeated by a point of order, and the Appropriations Committee of the House reported back the same appropriation as heretofore. Whereupon the House took the matter in its own hands, and by making a lump-sum appropriation, in accordance with existing law, gave the bureau the \$164,000 for which it asked. When the bill was reported to the Senate the Chief of the Children's Bureau urged the Senate committee to apportion this lump sum among the statutory positions, as originally designed. This was done, and the appropriation passed the Senate without a dissenting vote.

One year ago the bureau asked for an increase in its force, which was denied it.

This year it asked for an increase of \$187,520. The Bureau of Education asked for an increase of \$177,160, and the Public Health Service, which now has an appropriation of \$3,103,156, asked for an increase of \$325,256. Again the House Committee on Appropriations refused to grant the increase, and the House, by making again a provision for a lump sum, voted the bureau an increase of \$109,000. Again the chief of the bureau appeared before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and asked that the sum granted by the House be apportioned among the statutory positions, as before. The Senate committee declined to do this, and simply amended the bill by striking out the increase granted by the House.

The bureau believed, and its estimates were concurred in by the Secretary of Labor, that \$187,000 additional were needed for the successful prosecution of its work. The House agreed to give \$109,000 increase, and the Committee on Appropriations asks that no increase be given.

The Senate committee further amended the House bill by reducing the maximum per diem for expert service from \$8 to \$6 a day, and the total amount for traveling expenses, employment of special agents, and the purchase of material for publication from \$95,000 to \$58,000.

It was argued on the floor of the Senate that this decrease in the total appropriation was due to the decrease from \$8 a day to \$6 a day in the Senate amendment, as the maximum per diem for expert service. The following table shows the rates of pay for expert service for the 7 persons employed at \$8 per day for 377 days to have been \$3,016 in the year 1916. It is argued that the cutting down of the per diem from \$8 to \$6 accounts for the whole decrease in the appropriation. Yet we find that the total decrease is \$78,400 instead of the \$3,000, which can be covered by the cut in the rate of per diem from \$8 to \$6 on the basis of the 1916 expenditure.

Disposition of positions at specified rates of pay, 1916 appropriation.

Rates.	Number of persons.	Total time worked.	Cost.
50 cents per hour.....	5	584 hours.....	\$292.00
\$1 per annum.....	19	19 years.....	19.00
\$2.75 per diem.....	1	82 days.....	225.50
\$3.00 per diem.....	24	1,131 days.....	3,394.50
\$3.50 per diem.....	2	326½ days.....	1,143.00
\$4.00 per diem.....	13	791 days.....	3,164.00
\$6.00 per diem.....	1	212 days.....	1,272.00
\$8.00 per diem.....	7	377 days.....	3,016.00
Total.....	72		12,526.00

Those employed at \$1 per annum were people in different parts of the country who thus received some official recognition for the service they did in cooperating with the Children's Bureau in its effort to secure birth-registration legislation by the different States.

The experts at a maximum of \$8 per day are people who are asked to render expert service in the way of reading manuscripts and advising about their publication—service which can hardly be secured at any less amount.

The junior Senator from Florida made this inaccurate statement concerning the relation between the field agents and the office force. He said, "When you find out what they are going to do with the appropriation of \$72,000, it is for the employment of 57 more clerks to stay here in Washington with the 76 they now have." And again he states that, "Only those designated as field agents, of which there are five, I think, will leave the city."

The fact is that of the 76 present members of the staff 27 are field agents, and of the 57 additional members asked for 13 are to be field agents in addition to the 27 persons doing expert temporary work outside of Washington, whose salaries are covered in the item of \$58,000 which the House increased to \$95,000 and the Senate reduced to \$58,000 again.

The senior Senator from California criticises the bureau for not doing more work in the District of Columbia. When it was pointed out to him that the bureau had published a pamphlet on the feeble-minded in the District of Columbia, the Senator contended, "I think one of the things that should be done by the Children's Bureau would be to make this investigation and to recommend to Congress what legislation seems to be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of the Children's Bureau."

With regard to this very matter of the care of the feeble-minded, the chief of the bureau appeared before the District Committee of the House and argued from the report which had been made, urging the provision of a colony for the feeble-minded of the District.

Again, the chief of the bureau was appointed by the President a member of the committee to prepare a bill for a model juvenile court for the District of Columbia; a bill which has passed the House and is now pending in the Senate with a favorable report.

The bureau has in press a report on recreation in the District of Columbia.

So the bureau seems to be receiving criticism for not doing what it was charged with not doing in ignorance of the facts, but which it is doing in fact, as shown by the records.

A great deal has been said about the duplication of work. The Bureau of Education and the Public Health Service being especially mentioned. The senior Senator from California speaks of a child labor committee, which was organized under the Bureau of Labor some years ago. There has never been any such committee. The National Child Labor Committee, which was instrumental in securing the creation of the Children's Bureau, is an organization entirely supported by private subscription and has no relation to the Federal Government. It is going somewhat far afield in the search for duplication to confound the work of the Children's Bureau with the work of the National Child Labor Committee.

The investigations made by the Bureau of Labor, the bureau which was afterward expanded into the Department of Labor, concerning the labor of women and children under the special appropriation made by Congress in 1907 is not being duplicated by any work that the Children's Bureau has done.

The charge that the Children's Bureau is duplicating the work of the Public Health Service was effectively answered by the Junior Senator from Oregon, who indicated the difference between the pamphlets published by the Public Health Service on the diseases of man and the pamphlets concerning the care of children published by the Children's Bureau.

Duplication is a word that should not be too loosely used. Duplication involves an original and a copy, and the challenge has been successfully made to show a single piece of work done by any other department of the Government which has been duplicated after the date of such publication by the Children's Bureau. If there has been duplication of work let the responsibility lie with the department which has done the duplication, and not with the Children's Bureau, which has proved itself to be entirely innocent in this regard, as was stated in a memorandum read by the Clerk of the Senate on Friday last, and published in the Record of January 19.

From this it appears that the only piece of duplication that has been done was done by the Public Health Service in publishing a pamphlet on the care of the baby after the work of the Children's Bureau on Infant Care, treating the subject from a popular standpoint, was already well under way, and that there has been a great demand for both pamphlets—greater than could be supplied.

The Senior Senator from New Hampshire contends that the activities of the bureau in connection with the celebration of Baby Week do not appeal to him as a very desirable thing. The Senator could

not have appreciated what an enormous advantage it has been to the communities of the Nation to study for a week under expert advice and assistance the problems of infancy. More than 2,200 localities this year throughout this country—the Children's Bureau working in cooperation with the General Federation of Women's Clubs—gave a week or a good part of a week to studying the needs of the babies in every locality, and considering whether the communities were giving the babies a fair chance for life and health. State universities and boards of health cooperated with local agencies.

Doubtless many more such communities will endeavor to make such a study this year, and it seems most unwise to cripple the activities of the bureau by denying it the increase it asks.

The Senior Senator from Wyoming made the point that we had better proceed slowly in this matter of increasing appropriations for the Children's Bureau. An increase of \$109,000 for doing more effectively the great work of investigating and reporting upon "all matters relating to the welfare of children and child life in this Republic" is not much more than has been asked for a single public-building bill in a not populous community.

The following table shows just what the increases are and for what purpose:

ANALYSIS OF NEW POSITIONS.		
Administrative clerk at \$2,000	-----	1
Research expert at \$2,000	-----	1
Clerks:		
Class 4—Increase of 3 at \$1,800	-----	3
1 head editorial.		
1 reference, translation, and research.		
1 statistical research expert.		
Class 3—Increase of 4 at \$1,600	-----	4
1 reference assistant expert.		
1 legal indexer.		
1 industrial research assistant.		
1 social service research assistant.		
Class 2—Increase of 6 at \$1,400	-----	6
1 secretary to assistant chief.		
1 hygiene research assistant.		
1 industrial research assistant.		
3 statistical examiners of schedules.		
Class 1—Increase of 7 at \$1,200	-----	7
1 reference indexer.		
5 statistical tabulating clerks.		
1 stenographer-clerk.		
Clerks at \$1,000—Increase of 17	-----	17
9 statistical clerks.		
7 stenographers, general administration.		
1 assistant filing clerk.		
Special agents at \$1,400—Increase of 5	-----	5
All to be used for surveys, chiefly rural, child welfare, including child labor.		
Special agents at \$1,200—Increase of 8 submitted for rural work	-----	8
5 qualified as trained nurses.		
3 as special agents for general field work, rural or urban, including child labor and accident studies.		
Copypists at \$900—Increase of 4	-----	4
General economy office force.		
1 assistant messenger \$720.		
Total positions	-----	57

The following table shows a list of projects that are being held up for lack of assistance in the office, and why more clerks in the office are needed. The value of such publications is in their timeliness, and if they are postponed unduly the conditions may change to some extent so as to render the reports less valuable. Therefore the criticism of the senior Senator from Florida as to the number of clerks to be employed in Washington, while not founded upon the real facts in the case, falls entirely to the ground when the need is set forth for such assistance as will enable the bureau to publish promptly the reports whose material is collected by field agents and special agents:

JANUARY 20, 1917.

Twenty-four reports in process are retarded in the office for lack of clerical assistance commensurate with the field service, as follows:

Infant mortality studies	-----	5
Akron, Brockton, New Bedford, Saginaw, Waterbury.		
Industrial studies	-----	12
Child-labor handbook, administration of child-labor laws: Ohio, Massachusetts, Maryland, Wisconsin, Providence, St. Louis, New Orleans, Detroit, Newark, Philadelphia, and Street Trades Report.		
Rural child and maternal welfare studies, in North, South, and West		
Illegitimacy	-----	3
Feeble-minded children	-----	1
Recreation report	-----	1
Mothers' pensions	-----	1
Total	-----	24

The bureau has been given a great task by Congress. Some of those who opposed the creation of the bureau are naturally opposed to any increase in the activities of the bureau, but since Congress by an overwhelming vote of both Houses did create the bureau; did charge it with a great task for advancing the welfare of child life through investigation and publication of the facts; since the bureau feels that it needs an increase of \$178,000, but is willing to accept the increase which the House gave it of \$109,000; it does seem that the Senate should grant the same increase and not stop all progress along these lines of endeavor.

Following that I want to call the attention of the Senate to the next reduction in this bill and the reason given by the committee for striking out the \$72,120 provided by the House of Representatives for carrying on the work, as indicated in the bill. On page 143 of the bill the first three lines contain the item stricken out by the committee, which is as follows:

To investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially investigate the questions of infant mortality, \$72,120.

The reason which the committee, through its members on this floor, assign for striking that out is that it duplicates the work of other bureaus and departments of the Government. The committee submitted to the Senate just two authorities in support of their statement that the Children's Bureau in the work provided for by that appropriation was duplicating work performed by other departments and bureaus of the Government. First, the Senator from Florida read the evidence of Mr. Wood, of the Bureau of Efficiency, upon that subject, and, second, the Senator read a statement from the report of the Secretary of Labor to support the contention of the committee that there was duplication of the work provided for in the first three lines on page 143 of the bill, to wit:

To investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially investigate the questions of infant mortality, \$72,120.

The only evidence of duplication furnished to the Senate is the testimony of Mr. Wood, of the Efficiency Commission, and a statement read from the report of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. BRYAN. And, if the Senator will permit me, the absolute evidence of the documents showing the duplication.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The evidence of the pamphlets the titles of which the Senator read means nothing. The Senator exhibited a bundle of pamphlets here, from which he read the titles, and asked the Senate to believe from the titles of those pamphlets that a duplication of work was being carried on by the different bureaus. No one, not even the Senator himself, professed to have examined those pamphlets, or, if he had examined the contents of the pamphlets, he did not show by any presentation of material from those pamphlets that there was any duplication of work. But, Mr. President, even if he had done so, it would signify nothing, for by the terms of the law of Congress that particular field was assigned to the Children's Bureau, and any other bureau that invades that field reserved by the law to the Children's Bureau is the bureau that should be limited, either through a cut in its appropriation or by legislation limiting the authorization of its work to other fields. Understand me, Senators, the law that created the Children's Bureau by its very terms made the particular investigation provided for by this item as the work of the Children's Bureau and of no other branch or department or bureau of this Government. That law provides:

The said bureau shall investigate and report to said department upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life among all classes of our people, and shall especially investigate the questions of infant mortality.

Find that, if you will, in the authorization of the work of any other bureau in specific terms.

Mr. BRYAN. What is that?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is the law which created the Children's Bureau and which gives it by its very terms the exclusive field of the investigation of infant mortality by specific words.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator does not deny that the Public Health Service has the same authority, does he?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I deny that any other bureau authorized to do work generally along the lines of health and sanitation can, against a specific provision of that sort in the statute creating this bureau, invade the investigating work of this bureau on child mortality. There can not be any question about that, because the language is specific.

Mr. BRYAN. What does the Senator have to say about the \$250,000 appropriated for the Bureau of Health—

For investigations of diseases of man and conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof, including sanitation—

And so forth?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is a general authorization and can not be cited to take away from the Children's Bureau the specific authority conferred upon it by the statute. I do not care what Congress may have done in a blundering way in giving to some other bureau a large appropriation. I know that some bureaus have the special favor of the Appropriations Committee and some have not.

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, well, the Senator can not justify that statement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And we may get a little more light on that before this discussion is closed.

Mr. BRYAN. I will not interrupt the Senator until he furnishes it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If I furnish it, it will be worthy the attention of the Senator.

Mr. BRYAN. Well, the Senator has not furnished it so far.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I want the Senators who are following me here to get that specific declaration of the law well in their minds.

The said bureau shall investigate and report to said department upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life among all classes of our people, and shall especially investigate the questions of infant mortality, the birth rate, orphanage, juvenile courts, desertion, dangerous occupations, accidents and diseases of children, employment, legislation affecting children in the several States and Territories.

Now, Mr. President, a member of this committee, the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], offered the testimony of Mr. Wood and the statement of Secretary Wilson in support of the cut in this item. I shall presently talk about the work that the bureau has undertaken and is prosecuting under the provision of the law directing it to make an investigation of infant mortality, its importance to the very life of this Nation. But, first, Mr. President, let us see upon what authority this committee concluded that there was such a duplication of work as warranted it in driving the Children's Bureau out of this field which the law has said it should occupy and giving it to some other bureau under such general terms as an authorization to investigate the public health.

Now, let us see what Mr. Wood said about it, and aside from the high value of the work, which this bureau is doing in that field there is not any better reason that the Senate can find for restoring that very item than the statement of Mr. Wood. I will read that portion of it which the Senator from Florida read and put in the RECORD as his justification for cutting out this appropriation of \$72,000 for prosecuting a study of infant mortality by the Children's Bureau as provided by law. Listen, The Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] is speaking:

Now, coming to the item stricken out of the bill at the top of page 143—an appropriation of \$72,120 for the Children's Bureau to investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially to investigate the questions of infant mortality—the reasons that induced the committee to strike that out, I think, can be best stated by reading from the House hearings the testimony of Mr. Wood, of the Efficiency Bureau. I will not read it all, but here is the situation which exists now. The Bureau of Health is engaged in this same kind of work. The Bureau of Labor is engaged in the same sort of work.

Mr. President, those are very general statements—statements, however, the importance of which requires that they be backed up by something that shows that the two bureaus referred to are doing the kind of work which the Children's Bureau is doing in investigating the causes of infant mortality in this country. I am going to put in the RECORD a summary of the investigative work already under way by this bureau on that subject, and I challenge any Senator on this floor to put side by side with it the reported work of any other bureau which will show a duplication of that work. You may find that some bureau prosecuting its work under some loose general authorization of Congress has investigated whooping cough or diphtheria, but those diseases are not touched here. This investigation has another and a broader significance which strikes down to the root of our industrial life, and no other bureau and no other department has touched that field with regard to infant mortality. And, Mr. President, until the Senate and the country understand what it is proposed shall be done here the great work of this bureau shall not be stricken down without protest that will be heard.

I continue reading from Senator BRYAN'S statement:

For instance, under the heading "Field investigations," in the Bureau of Health, I find the following.

Now, mark you, this is given as a reason for striking out the item of appropriation of \$72,000 to prosecute an investigation of infant mortality along lines specially and solely prosecuted by this particular bureau.

He says:

For investigations of diseases of man and conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof, including sanitation, etc., \$250,000.

Now, he comments on that as follows:

That is in the sundry civil bill of last year. In this very bill, on page 102, we find the following—

I am going to ask to have the general conversation suspended a little bit. We will make more progress with this bill if that is done.

The VICE PRESIDENT rapped with his gavel.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, there is a continuous buzz at the back end of the Chamber which prevents those of us who would like to hear the Senator from hearing him. I insist that we should have order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, since this interruption has taken place, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will not suspend his remarks, that I may ask to have the bill temporarily laid aside?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly; I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the bill now under consideration be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. OVERMAN. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Gronna	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harding	Nelson	Smoot
Borah	Hardwick	Newlands	Sterling
Brady	Hitchcock	Norris	Stone
Brandegee	Hollis	Overman	Sutherland
Broussard	Hughes	Page	Swanson
Bryan	Husting	Phelan	Thomas
Catron	James	Pittman	Thompson
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Polindexter	Tillman
Clapp	Jones	Pomerene	Townsend
Clark	Kenyon	Ransdell	Underwood
Colt	Kern	Reed	Vardaman
Culberson	La Follette	Robinson	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lane	Saulsbury	Walsh
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Warren
Dillingham	Lippitt	Sheppard	Watson
Fall	Lodge	Sherman	Weeks
Fernald	McCumber	Shields	Williams
Fletcher	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Works

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. STONE (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.). Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Chair to visit the President of the United States and inform him of the action taken by the Senate in response to his communication have performed the duty assigned to them, and I report that the President has indicated his pleasure and desire to respond at 1 o'clock. He is now awaiting the presence of the committee.

At 1 o'clock p. m. the President of the United States was announced by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate (Charles P. Higgins), and the President was escorted by the committee to a seat on the right of the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, the President of the United States.

The President addressed the Senate, as follows (S. Doc. No. 685):

Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate: On the eighteenth of December last I addressed an identic note to the governments of the nations now at war requesting them to state, more definitely than they had yet been stated by either group of belligerents, the terms upon which they would deem it possible to make peace. I spoke on behalf of humanity and of the rights of all neutral nations like our own, many of whose most vital interests the war puts in constant jeopardy. The Central Powers united in a reply which stated merely that they were ready to meet their antagonists in conference to discuss terms of peace. The Entente Powers have replied much more definitely and have stated, in general terms, indeed, but with sufficient definiteness to imply details, the arrangements, guarantees, and acts of reparation which they deem to be the indispensable conditions of a satisfactory settlement. We are that much nearer a definite discussion of the peace which shall end the present war. We are that much nearer the discussion of the international concert which must thereafter hold the world at peace. In every discussion of the peace that must end this war it is taken for granted that that peace must be followed by some definite concert of power which will make it virtually impossible that any such catastrophe should ever overwhelm us again. Every lover of mankind, every sane and thoughtful man must take that for granted.

I have sought this opportunity to address you because I thought that I owed it to you, as the council associated with me in the final determination of our international obligations, to disclose to you without reserve the thought and purpose that have been taking form in my mind in regard to the duty of our Government in the days to come when it will be necessary to lay afresh and upon a new plan the foundations of peace among the nations.

It is inconceivable that the people of the United States should play no part in that great enterprise. To take part in such a service will be the opportunity for which they have sought to prepare themselves by the very principles and purposes of their polity and the approved practices of their Government ever since the days when they set up a new nation in the high and honourable hope that it might in all that it was and did show mankind the way to liberty. They cannot in honour withhold the service to which they are now about to be challenged. They do not wish to withhold it. But they owe it to themselves and to the other nations of the world to state the conditions under which they will feel free to render it.

That service is nothing less than this, to add their authority and their power to the authority and force of other nations to guarantee peace and justice throughout the world. Such a settlement cannot now be long postponed. It is right that before it comes this Government should frankly formulate the conditions upon which it would feel justified in asking our people to approve its formal and solemn adherence to a League for Peace. I am here to attempt to state those conditions.

The present war must first be ended; but we owe it to candour and to a just regard for the opinion of mankind to say that, so far as our participation in guarantees of future peace is concerned, it makes a great deal of difference in what way and upon what terms it is ended. The treaties and agreements which bring it to an end must embody terms which will create a peace that is worth guaranteeing and preserving, a peace that will win the approval of mankind, not merely a peace that will serve the several interests and immediate aims of the nations engaged. We shall have no voice in determining what those terms shall be, but we shall, I feel sure, have a voice in determining whether they shall be made lasting or not by the guarantees of a universal covenant; and our judgment upon what is fundamental and essential as a condition precedent to permanency should be spoken now, not afterwards when it may be too late.

No covenant of cooperative peace that does not include the peoples of the New World can suffice to keep the future safe against war; and yet there is only one sort of peace that the peoples of America could join in guaranteeing. The elements of that peace must be elements that engage the confidence and satisfy the principles of the American governments, elements consistent with their political faith and the practical convictions which the peoples of America have once for all embraced and undertaken to defend.

I do not mean to say that any American government would throw any obstacle in the way of any terms of peace the governments now at war might agree upon, or seek to upset them when made, whatever they might be. I only take it for granted that mere terms of peace between the belligerents will not satisfy even the belligerents themselves. Mere agreements may not make peace secure. It will be absolutely necessary that a force be created as a guarantor of the permanency of the settlement so much greater than the force of any nation now engaged or any alliance hitherto formed or projected that no nation, no probable combination of nations could face or withstand it. If the peace presently to be made is to endure, it must be a peace made secure by the organized major force of mankind.

The terms of the immediate peace agreed upon will determine whether it is a peace for which such a guarantee can be secured. The question upon which the whole future peace and policy of the world depends is this: Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace, or only for a new balance of power? If it be only a struggle for a new balance of power, who will guarantee, who can guarantee, the stable equilibrium of the new arrangement? Only a tranquil Europe can be a stable Europe. There must be, not a balance of power, but a community of power; not organized rivalries, but an organized common peace.

Fortunately we have received very explicit assurances on this point. The statesmen of both of the groups of nations now arrayed against one another have said, in terms that could not be misinterpreted, that it was no part of the purpose they had in mind to crush their antagonists. But the implications of these assurances may not be equally clear to all,—may not be the same on both sides of the water. I think it will be serviceable if I attempt to set forth what we understand them to be.

They imply, first of all, that it must be a peace without victory. It is not pleasant to say this. I beg that I may be permitted to put my own interpretation upon it and that it may be understood that no other interpretation was in my thought. I am seeking only to face realities and to face them without soft concealments. Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation, under duress, at an intolerable sacrifice, and would leave a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only as upon quicksand. Only a peace between equals can last. Only a peace the very principle of which is equality and a common participation in a common benefit. The right state of mind, the right feeling between nations, is as necessary for a lasting peace as is the just settlement of vexed questions of territory or of racial and national allegiance.

The equality of nations upon which peace must be founded if it is to last must be an equality of rights; the guarantees exchanged must neither recognize nor imply a difference between big nations and small, between those that are powerful and those that are weak. Right must be based upon the common

strength, not upon the individual strength, of the nations upon whose concert peace will depend. Equality of territory or of resources there of course cannot be; nor any other sort of equality not gained in the ordinary peaceful and legitimate development of the peoples themselves. But no one asks or expects anything more than an equality of rights. Mankind is looking now for freedom of life, not for equiposes of power.

And there is a deeper thing involved than even equality of right among organized nations. No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property. I take it for granted, for instance, if I may venture upon a single example, that statesmen everywhere are agreed that there should be a united, independent, and autonomous Poland, and that henceforth inviolable security of life, of worship, and of industrial and social development should be guaranteed to all peoples who have lived hitherto under the power of governments devoted to a faith and purpose hostile to their own.

I speak of this, not because of any desire to exalt an abstract political principle which has always been held very dear by those who have sought to build up liberty in America, but for the same reason that I have spoken of the other conditions of peace which seem to me clearly indispensable,—because I wish frankly to uncover realities. Any peace which does not recognize and accept this principle will inevitably be upset. It will not rest upon the affections or the convictions of mankind. The ferment of spirit of whole populations will fight subtly and constantly against it, and all the world will sympathize. The world can be at peace only if its life is stable, and there can be no stability where the will is in rebellion, where there is not tranquillity of spirit and a sense of justice, of freedom, and of right.

So far as practicable, moreover, every great people now struggling towards a full development of its resources and of its powers should be assured a direct outlet to the great highways of the sea. Where this cannot be done by the cession of territory, it can no doubt be done by the neutralization of direct rights of way under the general guarantee which will assure the peace itself. With a right comity of arrangement no nation need be shut away from free access to the open paths of the world's commerce.

And the paths of the sea must alike in law and in fact be free. The freedom of the seas is the *sine qua non* of peace, equality, and cooperation. No doubt a somewhat radical reconsideration of many of the rules of international practice hitherto thought to be established may be necessary in order to make the seas indeed free and common in practically all circumstances for the use of mankind, but the motive for such changes is convincing and compelling. There can be no trust or intimacy between the peoples of the world without them. The free, constant, unthreatened intercourse of nations is an essential part of the process of peace and of development. It need not be difficult either to define or to secure the freedom of the seas if the governments of the world sincerely desire to come to an agreement concerning it.

It is a problem closely connected with the limitation of naval armaments and the cooperation of the navies of the world in keeping the seas at once free and safe. And the question of limiting naval armaments opens the wider and perhaps more difficult question of the limitation of armies and of all programmes of military preparation. Difficult and delicate as these questions are, they must be faced with the utmost candour and decided in a spirit of real accommodation if peace is to come with healing in its wings, and come to stay. Peace cannot be had without concession and sacrifice. There can be no sense of safety and equality among the nations if great preponderating armaments are henceforth to continue here and there to be built up and maintained. The statesmen of the world must plan for peace and nations must adjust and accommodate their policy to it as they have planned for war and made ready for pitiless contest and rivalry. The question of armaments, whether on land or sea, is the most immediately and intensely practical question connected with the future fortunes of nations and of mankind.

I have spoken upon these great matters without reserve and with the utmost explicitness because it has seemed to me to be necessary if the world's yearning desire for peace was anywhere to find free voice and utterance. Perhaps I am the only person in high authority amongst all the peoples of the world who is at liberty to speak and hold nothing back. I am speaking as an individual, and yet I am speaking also, of course, as the responsible head of a great government, and I feel confident that I have said what the people of the United States would

wish me to say. May I not add that I hope and believe that I am in effect speaking for liberals and friends of humanity in every nation and of every programme of liberty? I would fain believe that I am speaking for the silent mass of mankind everywhere who have as yet had no place or opportunity to speak their real hearts out concerning the death and ruin they see to have come already upon the persons and the homes they hold most dear.

And in holding out the expectation that the people and Government of the United States will join the other civilized nations of the world in guaranteeing the permanence of peace upon such terms as I have named, I speak with the greater boldness and confidence because it is clear to every man who can think that there is in this promise no breach in either our traditions or our policy as a nation, but a fulfilment, rather, of all that we have professed or striven for.

I am proposing, as it were, that the nations should with one accord adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world: that no nation should seek to extend its polity over any other nation or people, but that every people should be left free to determine its own polity, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful.

I am proposing that all nations henceforth avoid entangling alliances which would draw them into competitions of power, catch them in a net of intrigue and selfish rivalry, and disturb their own affairs with influences intruded from without. There is no entangling alliance in a concert of power. When all unite to act in the same sense and with the same purpose all act in the common interest and are free to live their own lives under a common protection.

I am proposing government by the consent of the governed; that freedom of the seas which in international conference after conference representatives of the United States have urged with the eloquence of those who are the convinced disciples of liberty; and that moderation of armaments which makes of armies and navies a power for order merely, not an instrument of aggression or of selfish violence.

These are American principles, American policies. We could stand for no others. And they are also the principles and policies of forward looking men and women everywhere, of every modern nation, of every enlightened community. They are the principles of mankind and must prevail. [Applause.]

Upon the conclusion of the address, at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m., the President of the United States, escorted by the committee of the Senate, retired from the Chamber.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside that we may proceed with the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to inquire what was the action taken?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business before the Senate—the water-power bill—was temporarily laid aside that the appropriation bill might be proceeded with. Is that course satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. WALSH. It is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside and the Senate resumes consideration of the appropriation bill.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CLAPP. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Brady	Chamberlain	Cummins
Bankhead	Brandagee	Clapp	Fall
Beckham	Broussard	Coit	Fletcher
Borah	Catron	Culberson	Gallinger

Hardwick	Lippitt	Reed	Swanson
Hollis	Lodge	Robinson	Thomas
Hughes	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury	Thompson
Husting	Myers	Sheppard	Underwood
James	Nelson	Sherman	Vardaman
Johnson, Me.	Norris	Shields	Walsh
Jones	Overman	Smith, S. C.	Watson
Kenyon	Page	Smoot	Williams
Kern	Phelan	Sterling	Works
La Follette	Poindexter	Stone	
Lee, Md.	Pomerene	Sutherland	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I know how difficult it will be to bring the Senate back to a consideration of the pending question. I think we must all feel, sir, that we have passed through an important hour in the life of the world. The business before the Senate, upon which I was addressing this body, related to the striking out of the provision on page 143 of the pending bill, which is as follows:

To investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially investigate the questions of infant mortality, \$72,120.

If this provision is to be stricken out, Mr. President, this body will go on record as deciding that it will not spend \$72,120 to prosecute an investigation as to the death rate among children of very tender age—of infant mortality—and if it takes that position, it will take it with the fact on the record that there is an investigation of that sort under way by a bureau of this Government authorized by law to make the investigation, and it is the only bureau of this Government that is authorized by law to make that investigation.

In specific terms the Congress of the United States directed this bureau to ascertain all the facts surrounding the vitally important question of the high death rate among children of very tender age; and, Mr. President, the Census Bureau furnishes ample reasons why Congress should so legislate. It records the startling fact that out of every eight children born in the United States at least one dies before it reaches the age of 1 year. I suppose that it was in contemplation of that high mortality rate that Congress enacted this legislation. Congress concluded that it was necessary, right at the fountain-head of national life, to ascertain what meant this rapid and devastating depletion. If the American people are to undertake to hold and maintain their high place among the nations of the world, then, sir, we must conserve our national life. Where shall we begin? At its source. If we find there a death rate that is appalling, is it not reasonable that Congress shall so legislate as, first of all, to know the facts about it; to ascertain the underlying causes? You can treat with legislation no case affecting our national life excepting that it be accurately and scientifically diagnosed.

Mr. President, it seems that we had a bureau clothed with power to make general investigations with regard to health conditions; but that was not enough. That is a tremendous field of inquiry in itself. That related to diseases that afflict mankind all the way from birth to the tomb; but in the wisdom of Congress it was believed necessary that there should be a thoroughgoing investigation, such an investigation as would be productive of results that, when laid before the American people in popular form, would work reformation and bring about a saving of child life to this Nation. To that end Congress, after mature deliberation, built up the Children's Bureau. This bureau, in pursuance of the act which created it, keeping rigidly and precisely within the limits of that act, has prosecuted its investigations.

Sir, if there be fault anywhere, such as the criticisms of the committee in charge of this bill would indicate, I very much fear that it lies at our own door rather than with the department. Congress, Mr. President, legislates somewhat loosely. There has been for a considerable period more or less discussion as to whether or not it would be wise for Congress to establish a bill-drafting bureau or division to aid Congress in its work of preparing legislation. Many of the most important parliamentary bodies in the world employ an agency of that kind, among them the British Parliament, and many of the States of our own Union. There has been discussion from time to time here upon this floor as to whether or not it might be wise for us to employ men who would carefully consider bills pending before Congress, who would, when called upon, aid in framing legislation, with a view, Mr. President, that the laws enacted by Congress should be wisely enacted and should attain the objects sought by the membership of the two branches of the legislative department of this Government.

I myself have urged upon this floor the passage of legislation which would lead to our having the aid of men expert in the work of drafting bills, and who would study particularly the

statutes of the Federal Government, to the end that we shall not be constantly enacting overlapping statutes, duplicating and confusing the work of Congress.

Now, Mr. President, we have a situation here which is some explanation of the attitude taken by the committee. Congress itself has made authorizations which overlap each other. It is not difficult, Mr. President; it is simple to read the legislative enactments which created the Health Bureau, the bureau in the Department of Labor which investigates industrial conditions and gathers statistics; the Children's Bureau, and various other bureaus which have been cited here as being in conflict with and duplicating the work of each other; but, Mr. President, I stand here to say that Congress has been in a large measure protected against its own blundering by the departments. They have helped amazingly to prevent duplication of work; but they have not been able to stop it altogether, because Congress has authorized this bureau in that department, another bureau in another department, and another bureau in yet another department to do the work, and not only authorized but directed each to do the work, and the direction and authorization are imperative. They are under the command of Congress to do it, and oftentimes the phraseology of such legislative enactments is so general, so inapt, so inartistic, so unscientific that they overrun each other and lead to more or less confusion in the departments. Mr. President, the departments have sought again and again, as shown by their reports, to restrict their operations clearly within what they might assume, not from the language used but broadly interpreting the intent of Congress, was its purpose in directing that work be done. There has been an effort on the part of the various bureaus of the Government to take counsel with each other in an endeavor not to squander the public money as is directed by the specific terms of the acts passed by Congress, but to serve the purposes of legislation and yet not duplicate the work.

Notwithstanding that, Mr. President, there may be some duplication of work. But, sir, when you come to the item under consideration, upon which I am addressing the few Members of the Senate who are now present—of course if this were a public-building bill, where every Senator had some "pork" in the barrel, they would be on the job looking out for it, but as this is only a matter which concerns the life of the Nation there are only 13 Senators present, and I have a notion to call their names in order that that may be known who they are.

Senators should understand that back of this is a question of whether we can reduce the high death rate in the first year of the life of the children of the country. There is an amendment pending, proposed by the Committee on Appropriations, to strike out \$72,120, asked for by the bureau and granted by the House of Representatives to continue an investigation upon that subject, when the facts, generally stated, are that one baby out of every eight born dies before the age of 1 year. Now, the investigation that is to be interrupted by the economic policy of the committee shows, Mr. President, from intensive studies of particular localities that in certain localities the death rate of children of tender age is phenomenally high, and that it bears some relation to the wages that the fathers earn and to the conditions under which those children are born, to the burdens which the mothers of those children had to carry when they were carrying the children before birth, and to the labor that they had to perform within the four months after the birth of the baby. These investigations are conducted with thoroughness. They do not deal with diseases that the health department is investigating; they deal with conditions peculiar to the life of the American people and vital to be understood if we are to perpetuate a great and a vigorous nation. For the paltry saving of \$72,000 this great study, the details of which I shall lay before the Senate—I am only waiting until more Senators are here—is to be suspended. The question is whether, for the sake of this contemptible pittance of \$72,000, we are going on blindly in our ignorance, permitting conditions to continue here under which the infant mortality rate is not one in eight, but one in four or one in six, for that is what it is under some of the conditions that this investigation, so far as conducted, shows to exist. Mr. President, powerful as the great Appropriations Committee is, no committee of this Senate and no branch of the legislature is powerful enough to interpose between the greed of the manufacturing classes who employ labor in this country and the perpetuation of a vigorous American people.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. In view of the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin that there are only 13 Senators present—which

I think, however, is rather a high number during a discussion of this matter—I think that more Senators should be present; and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The SECRETARY called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Fletcher	Nelson	Smoot
Beckham	Gallinger	Norris	Sterling
Borah	Hughes	Page	Thomas
Brandegge	Husting	Poindexter	Thompson
Broussard	James	Reed	Vardaman
Bryan	Jones	Saulsbury	Walsh
Catron	Kenyon	Shafroth	Watson
Chamberlain	Kern	Sheppard	Weeks
Clapp	Lane	Sherman	Works
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Shields	
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	
Fernald	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I rise to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] through illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. HUSTING. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] is unavoidably absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call discloses the presence of 45 Senators. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators; and Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, and Mr. SUTHERLAND answered to their names when called.

Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. HOLLIS, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. STONE, and Mr. PHELAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators have answered to their names. The roll call discloses that a quorum is present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I must stand, I suppose, by the record, although an actual count does not disclose any more Senators present, I think, than were present when the call came for a quorum.

I was anxious, Mr. President, that there should be something approaching a quorum actually present when I laid before the Senate the reasons which the committee gave for striking out this appropriation of \$72,000; and I think I shall simply have to discuss something else while waiting for the return of a real quorum—a quorum that will be persistent and lasting—before I take up that subject.

Mr. President, I think perhaps I can not better improve the waiting period than by reading from the last report of the Chief of the Children's Bureau upon the particular subject covered by these three lines at the top of page 143, where it is proposed to strike out an appropriation of \$72,600 and suspend this work that is being done by the bureau at this time. Fortunately, the work had gotten far enough under way to justify itself, to attest its great value, to reflect the extraordinary executive ability of the head of this bureau.

It is well understood by the great woman who presides over this bureau what it was that Congress really wanted that bureau to accomplish; that it was not a technical, scientific investigation of this disease germ or that disease germ, but that it was what the law would indicate—an investigation of conditions of the very deepest concern to the Government and to the people of this country pertaining to child life. So these investigations have been prosecuted in a way to help out, measurably, the blundering work of Congress, and not duplicate anything that was being done by the Health Bureau, but to procure information that is essential to intelligent legislation in dealing with our great industrial problems.

While the investigation prosecuted by the head of the Children's Bureau has not been scientific in its character as medical science would understand and define the term, it is scientific from an economical standpoint; and that is the sort of science that Congress can best appreciate and that will be most useful to us in framing legislation.

Take, Mr. President, the work of the Children's Bureau on infant mortality. I pause just a moment to say that the fourth annual report of the Chief of the Children's Bureau for the fiscal year 1916, after the usual introductory paragraph, begins its information to the Secretary, and through the Secretary to Congress, with a somewhat detailed statement entitled "infant mortality inquiry and related work." That is on page 1 of this report.

Mr. President, I have in my hand the proceedings of the Senate of the United States on January 18, 1917. The RECORD of that date shows that we had but just reached this provision in the bill. The discussion was still in its first stages. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] had early taken the floor. The subject had first been introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] and discussed through about a quarter of a column of the RECORD. Then the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] had taken the floor and, dividing the time with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BOBAH] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], he occupied about a page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Then the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] addressed the Senate. But the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] had the floor, and he was endeavoring to lay before the Senate the real issue with regard to the striking out of this appropriation of \$72,000 for the investigation of infant mortality. He had before him this report of that investigation, contained in the fourth annual report of the bureau. The infant-mortality section, which opens the report, is perhaps the most important thing in it, and takes up a couple of pages of the report; and the Senator from Iowa laid before the Senate some of the important facts developed from the investigation.

I happened to be in my place at the time. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], I suppose, as chairman of the subcommittee, seemed to be in charge of the bill upon this paragraph, as he had been upon others. At any rate, he was carrying for the time being the burden of the defense of the committee's recommendations. I was perfectly astounded, Mr. President, having read this report, sitting here in my place, to hear the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] make the statement which I am going to read to the Senate. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] was laying before the Senate some of these startling facts with respect to infant mortality and the causes thereof. This report of this great bureau opened with a condensed statement of the bureau's work upon that intensely vital subject in American life. The Senator from Iowa, concluding a statement upon the subject, using the facts of the report, said:

In this country last year there were 300,000 babies under 1 year of age, as the statistics show, who died; one out of every eight of the babies born failed to reach 1 year of age. This bureau has investigated this question of infant mortality. That is one of the great features of the work that it has done. They went into Manchester, in the State of New Hampshire—

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that they are doing that work now?

Mr. KENYON. They are doing that work now.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. HOLLIS. I desire to state that it is my opinion that the work that is being done in Manchester, N. H., in investigating infant mortality could never be done under the city authority or under the State authority, because the strength of the textile mills in that locality is such that they would not permit it to be done properly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, Mr. President, I thank the Senator for that.

The power of the German Nation in this world war, Mr. President, the loyalty of the German people to that Nation, has amazed the world. It is not a Kaiser's war, so far as Germany is concerned, whatever we may think about it. One and all, as one people—socialists who hate the name of war, imperialists, agrarians, clerics—all are ready to go into the trenches of hell and death, and be buried there, for the German Government.

What does it signify? It means, sir, that they have a Government over there that takes care of the German people from birth to the time when they are enabled to enter the armies of the Kaiser. We are prone these days to complain of the American people because of our enlargement of the Regular Army that we can not get enlistments under the Old Flag. Our Navy is publishing in every center of population in America graphic pictures upon the billboards to induce enlistments in the Navy, and they are some 20,000 or more short. If there be any man on this floor who has addressed in campaigns gatherings of wage earners, and it has sometimes fallen to me to do it, he can not help, as I have, to have seen the difference with which the wage earners in this country responds to appeals to glorify our Government and the flag. Twenty-five years ago you could bring an audience of laboring men to their feet cheering for Old Glory and what it did for liberty, for freedom, for emancipation; but Mr. President, when you grind the faces of the poor, when you force the parents to put their children into the factories in order that they may exist, when you have little care for the death rate in the homes where the children of the poor are born, you

are sowing the seed of a disregard and a resentment against this Government of professed equality for all that may bring upon us at some time that which we would most deprecate, which we would most of everything in life wish to put from us.

Mr. President, you can make no stronger appeal to the wage earners or to the Government, you can make no address upon patriotism which will so stir the hearts of the wage earners of the country as to let them know that our own Government, our good old Government, has some regard for them. They have had a little advance in wages, but while they were getting it they have seen the combinations of manufacturers advance the cost of living 100 per cent while they were getting 15 and 16 per cent advance in wages. They know perfectly well that this most progressive nation of all the world, this most inventive nation of all the world, is producing more cheaply to-day than ever before in the history of mankind. They know perfectly well, because they work with these machines that almost talk. They know perfectly well, sir, that the raw material is now seized by automatic hands, and that it passes from machine to machine with but a small fraction of the hand labor that was in it 25 years ago, and finally comes out, with the direction of a skilled workman here and there, a finished product at not 25 per cent the cost of hand labor of a quarter of a century ago. They know that. They do not require Senators and economists to teach them that; and they know perfectly well that with this enormous increase in the cost of living piled upon their bended backs they find it next to impossible to make income meet expenses.

Mr. President, if we are utterly indifferent to the conditions under which they live and work, if we are utterly indifferent about the climbing cost of living, if we are not concerning ourselves about anything except a few questions that are vital to property, what is the issue to be? I ran over this morning in the paper the President's program. One of the first things, which is pending before the committee of which I am a member, the Interstate Commerce Committee, is a bill to authorize exporters to make combinations in order to extend our foreign trade. There seems to be a profound concern everywhere that the producer should be taken care of. With the cost of living almost beyond the reach of people of considerable income, to say nothing about the poor, we are invited to concern ourselves about the further draining of production in this country in order that we may add a large export to the profit of those who are putting up the cost of living upon the consumers of America.

There seems to be a fatal blindness upon the part of all of us, and when the little opportunity is afforded by the expenditure of \$72,000 to carry forward an investigation here that will tell the story of this awful mortality among the children of those who work for wages we find it opposed. When there is a little opportunity here to let the light into the homes of the toilers to know why it is that one out of every four babies of those who are earning \$450 a year must die before they are 12 months old, it is to be blocked in the interests of economy.

It may be, Mr. President, that I am expressing undue feeling upon this matter. I am not entirely a novice in public affairs. I have spent almost my whole life in dealing with these questions, and I am constrained to believe that it behooves the statesmanship of this country to give consideration to these things that concern the millions of the toilers of our country.

Mr. President, what was this investigation with respect to infant mortality? Let us see. I am going to read from Miss Lathrop's report:

The infant mortality inquiry is going forward—

Of course, she hoped it was going forward.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Surely.

Mr. BRYAN. Does the Senator think that the investigation of infant mortality would cease unless this appropriation is made?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I think it will cease with this bureau, and this is the only bureau of the Government that is authorized by law to conduct it.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me say to the Senator that the appropriations carried in the bill now authorize it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; it does not authorize that.

Mr. BRYAN. The request from the chief of the bureau was not in the language in which the House bill stands. It was for the employment of 57 more clerks, and that is all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there is not any mistake about what the head of this bureau wanted. The head of this bureau appeared before the committees of Congress.

Mr. BRYAN. The bureau has been doing that work.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. She indicated what was needed. She has been doing this work within a limited field of two towns, and

you apparently want to limit her to that field. I do not know whether there are many towns in the southern part of the country that the Senator or the other Senators from the South want to have shut out of this investigation, but if there are I do not believe that Congress will submit to it.

Mr. BRYAN. Of course the Senators from the South have as pure motives as the Senator from Wisconsin; that goes without saying; but I say that the people who are being employed will be limited not to two towns but to one town, the city of Washington, and that they will be sitting at clerks' desks here drawing a salary.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; the report shows plainly the contrary, and the statement made by the chief of this bureau before the Committee on Appropriations shows plainly the contrary. It shows that this appropriation is wanted for—

Field investigation.

Mr. President, it would almost appear that the members of the committee had never read the report.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator has read it. How many did she propose to send into the field of these 57?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will come to that if the Senator will content himself and let me pursue my argument in my own way. Here, listen to this. The Senator from Iowa had just said on the floor of this body:

In this country last year there were 300,000 babies under 1 year of age, as the statistics show, who died; one out of every eight of the babies born failed to reach 1 year of age. This bureau has investigated this question of infant mortality. That is one of the great features of the work that it has done. They went into Manchester, in the State of New Hampshire—

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that they are doing that work now?

Mr. President, here is the report. It shows that they are doing that work now, and the chief of the bureau, backed by the Secretary of Labor, as I will show presently, gave the committees of both Houses to understand that it was tremendously important that they should prosecute that work, continue it, go on with it, and this appropriation of \$72,000 was for that purpose and no other.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], replying to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], said:

Mr. KENYON. They are doing that work now.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of investigating the question of infant mortality?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly; and if the Senator had read the last report of Miss Lathrop he would have seen that she set out instances where they have made these investigations.

Mr. KENYON. Will it both the Senator if I suggest that the Senators, apparently, on the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Florida, who seem to have charge of the matter of cutting this appropriation, both voted against the establishment of this bureau and both voted against the child-labor act.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; it would not disturb me, because it would not surprise me.

Mr. President, no man on this floor likes to call for or suggest the absence of a quorum, and I am not going to do it when I am speaking, but there are just 17 Senators present. When we come to vote on the question whether this appropriation of \$72,000 shall be retained or not, it would not be at all strange if 20 or 30 Senators, enough to make a majority against the appropriation, should stroll in about that time in order to have a record of this matter, and should vote against the appropriation, and when asked about it should say, Oh, well, they were present the other day and got some smattering of the discussion that was going, and understood that the Children's Bureau was duplicating unlawfully work that ought to be performed by other bureaus. Mr. President, that is an unfortunate condition. If legislation can be disposed of—and it is often, as we all know—in that way, I do not know that there is any remedy for it. But, Mr. President, I am going to give to the few Senators who are here the reasons assigned by this committee for cutting this appropriation of \$72,000 to prosecute the investigation of infant mortality out of the bill. In the hope that another Senator or two may straggle in I am tempted to give the few Senators who are here a little idea of this report.

The infant mortality inquiry is going forward, and the reports upon the different communities studied are in various stages of progress.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] had not heard that or he never would have said:

Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that they are doing that work now?

That is, prosecuting this investigation of infant mortality. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] said:

They are doing that work now.

The Senator from North Carolina replied:

Of investigating the question of infant mortality?

Here is the report.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Surely.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator has misinterpreted the question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Perhaps so.

Mr. OVERMAN. I meant to say they are doing that work; that the appropriation we originally gave was for that purpose, and we gave them the same appropriation exactly that they have now. It was my idea that they are now investigating the very thing the bill provides for, and it was our purpose, instead of increasing the appropriation for all the departments, to hold them down to practically the same appropriations they had last year. That was the purpose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yet the Senator seemed surprised with the statement that they were prosecuting that investigation, for he said:

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that they are doing that work now?

Mr. KENYON. They are doing that work now.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of investigating the question of infant mortality?

If the Senator had read the last report of Miss Lathrop, he would have seen that she set out instances where they have made this investigation.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understood that, but I wanted to impress on the Senate the purpose of cutting down the appropriation, that they had money to do that work now and were doing the work now, because I knew it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I want to be perfectly fair. Can that work be done too rapidly when it shows as far as it is done that one baby out of four dies before it reaches the age of 12 months?

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator will yield—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not think that an appropriation of \$72,000 is a drop in the bucket to do that work. I think it will take hundreds of thousands of dollars to do it. The question in our minds was not to cripple the work of the bureau, but at this particular time in the appropriation bill to treat all alike. Here was the State Department, here was the Treasury Department; in other words, there were estimates for \$42,000,000. We held them down to last year's appropriations. We kept down not only the appropriations for this department, but every other department.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; there are some departments here the appropriations for which have been increased in this appropriation bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. In the main we cut them down. The Census Bureau is the only one which has any considerable amount of increase.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There are new offices created here with salaries of \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year, while this investigation, taking \$72,000, can not go ahead on account of the condition of the Treasury. We do not hesitate about passing river and harbor appropriation bills, or if we do we finally put them through; and there is the public-building bill of \$35,000,000 on its way over here. I wonder how many members of the Committee on Appropriations will stand up here and fight against the expenditure of \$35,000,000 for public buildings this year. I wonder how many members of this committee took that stand when more than \$400,000,000 was added to the military and naval program of a year ago.

Mr. OVERMAN. Here is one who voted against it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad you did. It is a record of which you will be proud hereafter.

Now, Mr. President, let us see about this investigation; how important it is.

The infant-mortality inquiry is going forward, and the reports upon the different communities studied are in various stages of progress. Field study has been completed in all the towns mentioned in the third annual report and has been begun in Baltimore. The study of Baltimore was undertaken because of its representative character, and because its size affords an opportunity to compare the figures for a large city with those of the smaller cities heretofore included in the inquiry. The field work alone in Baltimore will require at least a year's time.

INFANT MORTALITY—MANCHESTER.

The findings of the bureau's earlier study in Johnstown, Pa., are confirmed in many respects by the findings in Manchester—the coincidence of a high infant-mortality rate with low earnings, poor housing, mother's work, and large families.

Now, Mr. President, just bear in mind, and let the RECORD show in this connection, the statement made by the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS]. The investigation by this bureau in Manchester, N. H., a textile town, which conveys a lesson to the American people, can be made, and made only, by this Federal bureau, on the authority of the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire. I wonder if the Senator duly ap-

preciated the statement made by the junior Senator from New Hampshire. As I remember, he said it is a textile town, and that influences there were potential enough to prevent an investigation into the death rate among the babies of the employees in the textile industries, either a municipal investigation or a State investigation. Oh, sir, think of that. Why is that so? The Senate is to believe it. It is given to us on the authority of a Senator as highly thought of by its membership as any man on this floor. He tells you that there are potential forces that would baffle and prevent an investigation into the death rate of babies in that textile manufacturing town either by the State of New Hampshire or by the municipal government of Manchester. Oh, sir, that fact cries aloud to heaven for this appropriation. Shall this country be denied the information, denied the facts which are to be learned from a study—a critical, dispassionate study—of conditions in a manufacturing center of the United States, conditions that have to do with the future of the human race under our flag?

Mr. President, it is possible, if I read another paragraph or two here, that it would let in a flood of light upon the statement made by the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS]. If there is a power in Manchester, N. H., great enough to suppress an investigation into industrial conditions affecting the life of the families of the workers in the textile factories in that town, conducted by the municipal government, aye, more than that, which is strong enough to stay the arm of the State should it undertake the investigation, then, Mr. President, there must be some powerful reason why that is so. Why is it that that mighty power there wants to suppress and to cover up these facts?

Now, let us see. Fortunately, this Children's Bureau made a little start on this subject under the appropriation of last year. The superintendent of the bureau could not go into Massachusetts and Connecticut or into 20 or 30 other States, but she picked out and she made an investigation in Johnstown, Pa. Then this bureau took up this investigation in Manchester. Mr. President, it is all to the credit of the bureau and its chief that it does its work thoroughly; it is no sloughing over of the facts; it gets basic information. In this town of Manchester what did it discover? What was the result of this investigation?

The findings of the bureau's earlier study in Johnstown, Pa., are confirmed in many respects by the findings in Manchester—the coincidence of a high infant-mortality rate, with low earnings, poor housing, mother's work, and large families.

That is what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE], with his professional knowledge, would expect; but that is a matter that the Members of this body generally would not have much judgment about, except for the fortunate circumstance that we have some accurate statements on the subject. Now, listen—I am dealing with Manchester, N. H.—

The mortality rate among the 1,564 live-born babies studied in Manchester was 165 per 1,000 births, which is considerably higher than the estimated rate for the whole country.

You see, the whole country, based upon the census statistics, shows a death rate for the first year of 1 to 8, but—

The mortality rate among the 1,564 live-born babies studied in Manchester was 165 per 1,000 births, which is considerably higher than the estimated rate for the whole country.

Now, listen:

Manchester is primarily a textile town, and the textile mills employed 36.3 per cent of all the fathers of babies born in Manchester during the 12 months covered by the study.

Now, listen:

Of the fathers, 13.7 per cent were earning less than \$450 per year; 48.5 per cent less than \$650; 22.9 per cent, \$850 or more; 6.4 per cent, \$1,250 or more.

Now, let us get the related facts of the death rate to the earnings of the fathers of these 1,564 live-born babies:

Of the babies with fathers earning less than \$450, about 1 in 4 died before it was 12 months old. The great majority of the babies had fathers in the wage group from \$450 to \$849, and of these about 1 in 6 died. Of the babies whose fathers earned \$850 but less than \$1,050, 1 in 8 failed to survive. Where the fathers earned \$1,050 or more, 1 baby in 16 died in the first year.

Mr. President, is it unjust, is it unreasonable, can it possibly wrong anybody, to suggest that the relation between the death rate and the wages might possibly have something to do with the influences of the powers in this textile town that would prevent an investigation by the municipal government or by the State of New Hampshire? Oh, sir, does not the Senate begin to see that if these facts are of vital concern to the people of the United States, to our Government, to the perpetuation of the life of the race, the work has got to be done by the Federal Government; that these powerful local influences will be such that otherwise it can not be done at all? The junior Senator from New Hampshire conferred upon the Senate and

the country and this great issue a very important statement of facts when he made the announcement here on the floor of the Senate during this debate that the only way that this investigation into the relation between poor housing, large families, and poor wages and the high death rate of the children of these people can be made at all is by the Federal Government.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. HOLLIS. In order that the Senate may not think I made that statement lightly, I will add that a few years ago—perhaps five or six years ago—the textile mills in Manchester were openly and flagrantly violating the child-labor law. I was then a Democrat, as I now am. The superintendent of public instruction was a Republican. He was charged with the enforcement of the child-labor law by statute. He came to me and informed me of the situation in Manchester. He asked me if I would undertake to prosecute the violations of the child-labor law. I did not want to do it, for I thought it would be considered officious on my part, because I did not live in that county; but the superintendent urged me to do it, saying that he could not get anybody in the county to prosecute the cases; that he could not get anyone in his own party to do so, because the textile industries were so powerful in his own party. He appealed to me as a citizen of New Hampshire to support him in his effort to enforce the child-labor law in Manchester. Answering his appeal, one that I could not refuse when put in that way, I did prosecute those cases, secured convictions, and got the children out of the mills. I had one of my partners look up the facts, and in doing so he had to go among the homes of the children to ascertain how old they were. The reports that he brought to me of the way that those families lived were heartrending.

I therefore make this statement because I know of the conditions that have existed and the power of the corporations. I was not at first able to get convictions, because the judge of the police court before whom they were tried was under the influence of the owners of the textile mills. I announced that to him in his own court, and told him that if he did not do justice I should go over his head to the attorney general and secure informations. The next batch of cases I brought he decided properly, and convictions were secured.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am very glad that I dwelt upon this subject until the junior Senator from New Hampshire felt compelled to make this explanation, which I have no doubt is reluctantly made because of his own personal participation in the work of securing public justice; but I think it is a valuable contribution to this discussion, and I am glad to have it spread upon the Record here.

I need not say, Mr. President, that it is a high testimonial of the standard of public service and of the duties of citizenship, independent of public office, which every man owes to his community and to his country, but which all of us acquainted with the character of the junior Senator from New Hampshire would expect of a man of his high ideals.

Now, Mr. President, I lay before the Senate a little more of the details of this valuable report to show the thoroughness with which the investigation has been conducted; but they show also that the investigation is not one encroaching upon that prosecuted by the Public Health Service, which—and I use the term as applied to medicine—is technical and scientific. This is an investigation of the economic values and the economic bearings of all the facts which it discloses. It stands by itself; it has not any counterpart or duplicate in any of the investigations as to infant mortality prosecuted by any other Government agencies:

Where families lived two or more persons per room, the infant death rate was twice as high as where they lived less than one person per room. The babies living in houses occupied by a single family died at the rate of 86.1 per 1,000, but those in tenements, occupied by more than six families died at the rate of 236.6 per 1,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand the Senator is quoting from the report in relation to Manchester?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. All this portion of the report is devoted to the results of investigations in Manchester, and it is most vitally interesting.

Mr. OVERMAN. I was merely wondering why in Manchester as many as six families live in one tenement. That is what astonished me.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. I know something of the cities of the Senator's State, and I can state that it would contrast very markedly with the conditions existing in the manufacturing towns of North Carolina.

When the mother was a wage earner the baby's chances of living were less than when she was not. Babies of mothers who had worked at some time during the year before the baby's birth died at the rate of 199.2 per 1,000, while babies of nonworking mothers died at the rate of 133.9. Babies of mothers employed away from home some time during the year after childbirth while the baby was still alive and under 4 months old had a rate of 277.3, while babies of mothers not employed during that time had a rate of 122.

Babies of foreign-born mothers did not fare so well as babies of native mothers. The differences of rates, however, are only partly accounted for by their lower earnings. The largest foreign element in Manchester is Canadian French, and among them the infant mortality rate, 224 per 1,000 live births, is greater than that among any other group of the population, although their earnings are in general higher than those of other foreigners.

I read that paragraph to show that this is no partial investigation in the interest of some propaganda, but here we find a thoroughgoing, able investigator directing this work in the interest of truth.

Sheer size of family appears to be one factor in this high Canadian-French rate, one-third of their babies being sixth or later in order of birth, while over one-sixth of these mothers had had from 9 to 18 children. These Canadian-French babies in families of 6 or more children died at the rate of 246.2 per 1,000 and the rate rises to 277.2 per 1,000 when only babies ninth or later in order of birth are considered.

Less important numerically in this nationality is the wage-earning mother. Comparatively fewer Canadian-French mothers than other foreign mothers are gainfully employed. The percentages of these wage-earning Canadian-French mothers at work outside the home and in the home varied slightly during the two years, but there is among the working mothers a stronger tendency on the part of the Canadian French to work outside the home after the baby's birth than appears among other foreigners. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that artificial feeding is more prevalent among Canadian French than in any other group of the population, and this prevalence appears to be one of the important factors in the high infant mortality rate among Canadian-French babies as compared with the rate for babies of other nationalities.

Mr. President, I have taken the time of the Senate to read from the report what there is under that caption into the Record. It is vitally important in its facts, and it is important in the aspect of informing the Senate of the character of the work this bureau is doing. It is high-class work; it is work the value of which can not be overstated. We may not be able to meet this problem at once by an intelligent dealing with it in legislation, but the immediate value of this work will be its educational importance to the mothers, the homes, and those communities that are most deeply concerned, for, after all, Mr. President, in the long run that which is beneficial to the members of a given community is beneficial to the community as a whole, and by a widespread propaganda and publicity of the information obtained by these thorough-going investigations, we will probably attain the first valuable results in the communities themselves by arousing a public spirit and stimulating a public opinion which will work for the protection of the community.

Now, Mr. President, I turn aside for a moment from this report.

Mr. OVERMAN. Before the Senator leaves that branch of the subject, will he allow me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. I sent for the report of this bureau, which has been distributed since this debate began. The Senator seemed to think that I had not read it. Of course, I did not have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suppose not.

Now, Mr. President, the reason assigned by one of the members of this committee for striking out this appropriation was that it was a duplication of work performed by another bureau, and therefore in the interest of economy it ought not to be extended, but the appropriation of \$72,000 asked for for continuing the work should be cut out.

As authority for the action of the committee the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], a member of the committee, read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the testimony of Mr. Wood, of the Efficiency Bureau, and I want to present that to the Senate. Very few Members of the Senate were on the floor when that was read. We all of us have our obligations to our several committees; we have our special lines of investigation, which each of us is prosecuting as bearing upon national questions; and I appreciate the difficulties that Senators find in being present upon the floor of the Senate at all times during the consideration of bills. I know that I am perhaps as great a transgressor of that obligation, if it be an obligation, as any other Senator, or most other Senators, and I can only offer, Mr. President, the poor excuse of my personal conviction that I am better serving my constituency and better discharging my obligations to this body by prosecuting in my committee room or in the libraries of Congress investigations which have to do with legislation in this body. I think I may fairly say, without arrogating to myself anything that any other Member can not

say as well, that I am not off this floor at any time unless it be that I am engaged upon work which concerns my duties here upon the floor.

But I know how it is with myself, and so it is, I suppose, with others. We come back to the Senate. A vote is imminent. Much of the discussion has transpired in our absence. We hurriedly confer with Senators in whose judgment we have confidence and who happen to be present, and they give us the best counsel they can. They may have been absent during a very important part of the discussion. Then we make our choice of sides upon the question that is to be voted upon, and vote according to our best information and our best judgment. I suppose many Senators will come upon the floor when the vote comes upon this amendment, not having heard very much and not having read very much of the debate that pertains to this appropriation, and are likely to say to their associates here: "What do you think about it?" And they are very likely to be told: "Well, there has been some statement here that there is a lot of duplication, and it is a good time to economize, and I guess we had better vote against the appropriation."

I do not think I am overstating the lack of thoroughness of investigation that most questions are liable to receive at the hands of this body.

Mr. President, on page 143, in the first three lines, is this item:

To investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially to investigate the questions of infant mortality, \$72,120.

That is stricken out by this committee, and upon that Senators must vote either to retain it or to reject it.

I ask Senators to remember that the Children's Bureau is the only executive organization that is clothed by statute with specific authority to investigate that subject. And now I give the authority upon which one of the Senators based his reason for cutting out that appropriation, and I read what he said. I quote from the remarks of the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]:

Now, coming to the item stricken out of the bill at the top of page 143—an appropriation of \$72,120 for the Children's Bureau to investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially to investigate the questions of infant mortality—the reasons that induced the committee to strike that out, I think, can be best stated by reading from the House hearings the testimony of Mr. Wood, of the Efficiency Bureau. I will not read it all, but here is the situation which exists now. The Bureau of Health is engaged in this same kind of work.

Those three lines relate only to the investigation of "the welfare of children and child life, * * * especially * * * the questions of infant mortality"; and the report shows that that is what is going on.

The Senator from Florida says:

The Bureau of Labor is engaged in the same sort of work. For instance, under the heading "Field Investigations" in the Bureau of Health, I find the following:

"For investigations of diseases of man and conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof, including sanitation, etc., \$250,000."

That is the end of the quotation. Then the Senator says:

That is in the sundry civil bill of last year. In this very bill, on page 102, we find the following:

"For investigation of rural education, industrial education, and school hygiene, including personal services in the District of Columbia, etc., \$45,000."

Then there is an appropriation in the Bureau of Education.

Have you got anything so far, Senators, that seems to conflict with the investigations of infant mortality?

The Senator from Florida proceeds:

Here is what is said by this member of this board that has been directed to investigate duplication of work in these various bureaus and departments:

Now, mark you, a moment ago he said:

The reasons that induced the committee to strike that out, I think, can be best stated by reading from the House hearings the testimony of Mr. Wood, of the Efficiency Bureau.

And now he says:

Here is what is said by this member of this board that has been directed to investigate duplication of work in these various bureaus and departments.

Mr. Goop—

These are evidently from the House hearings, and Mr. Goop, a Member of the House, is asking questions of Mr. Wood, of the Efficiency Bureau—

Mr. Goop. I have noticed that the Department of Labor published last year Bulletin No. 162, Vocational Education Survey of Richmond, Va. The Bureau of Education is publishing a similar work of that kind. Have you investigated duplication of that kind?

Vocational education!

Mr. Wood. We have examined the publications of the departments for the past year—

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire from what page the Senator is reading?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am reading from page 1789 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. KENYON. Not from the report itself?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I am reading just what the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] read to the Senate as the reason for the action of the committee.

Mr. WOOD. We have examined the publications of the departments for the past year and found many places where, if there was no real duplication, there was at least an overlapping of functions. For example, the Bureau of Education and Health Bureau are both pursuing studies of school hygiene, though not in the same districts. Each is doing work that might be done by the other. Similarly, the Children's Bureau and the Health Bureau both publish bulletins on the care of babies.

It does not say that they are similar bulletins, or that they deal with a similar subject. Is that the sort of discrimination that this committee brought to bear in order to determine whether it would cut out this appropriation of \$72,000?

Mr. GOOD. That necessitates the keeping in two or more separate bureaus the same character of employees that ought to do the work in one bureau?

Mr. WOOD. The trouble seems to be that the authorizations given to the different bureaus cross or overlap.

That is the fault of Congress.

For example, the Children's Bureau is authorized to investigate anything pertaining to children.

Now, that is not very accurate for an investigator of efficiency, or for a member of this bureau. It is limited by special phrases. But let that go.

That includes children's health and education and various other matters. The Health Bureau is authorized to investigate health, whether of children or adults.

Now, the Senator from Florida makes this comment:

I have just shown that they have a quarter of a million dollars for that.

That is, the Health Bureau has a quarter of a million dollars for investigating the diseases that pertain to man. Now listen further.

Mr. Wood, continuing:

The Bureau of Education is authorized to investigate questions pertaining to education. Again, the Labor Bureau has always concerned itself with health insurance among laboring men. The Bureau of Public Health has recently taken up health insurance as a health measure. Both have issued publications on that subject.

Mr. GOOD. You have not gone into that?

Now, he sums it all up:

Mr. WOOD. We have made a partial list of cases in which different bureaus seem to cover the same field—

This expert on efficiency does not pretend to know that they do cover the same field.

We have made a partial list of cases in which different bureaus seem to cover the same field, but we came to the conclusion that it would be better to get every bureau to report to us every job it is working on, to index those jobs so that all relating to health would fall in one place, all relating to children in another, etc., and then to go carefully through the index, make note of cases in which there is duplication or overlapping, and bring them first to the attention of the various bureaus in order to get their statements of the case and then to the attention of Congress. We hope to do that by the next Congress.

But this committee, forestalling that work which a real investigator plainly showed was necessary to be done before they tampered with the work of any bureau, has seen fit to strike out of this appropriation this provision for the investigation of infant mortality.

There is all that the Senator from Florida read from this expert. I submit to the Senate that the conclusions of the expert ought to have bound the Senate committee; and if the expert was not willing to say that the work of a given bureau was not such a duplication that it was a waste of the public money and recommended its discontinuance, then, sir, the committee, in the discharge of its obligation as the arm of Congress carrying out the will of Congress as expressed in legislation which delegated to this bureau the investigation of infant mortality, should not have stricken out this appropriation.

But, sir, the committee further supports its action by quoting from the Secretary of Labor, the superior of the head of this Children's Bureau; and it must have impressed the Senate, or those Senators who listened to it, as almost decisive of this case—I refer to what was read from the report of Secretary Wilson, within whose department is this Children's Bureau—for he spoke of duplication of these various bureaus. He deprecated the confusion that results from the overlapping authorizations by Congress; and he said in his report—not only that portion of it which was read here, but elsewhere, for I have studied the report—that the solution of it immediately was the bringing together of these different arms in the administration of the law by the executive departments and seeing that they did not duplicate the work that Congress had authorized them to duplicate, if the authorizations were to be carried out.

But, Mr. President, in writing his general criticism upon this subject the Secretary of Labor was not writing with reference

to the Children's Bureau, or to its investigation of infant mortality. Now, I purpose to read what the Secretary said, as stated by the Senator from Florida. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and then, Mr. President, I will follow that by reading from a statement which I have received from Secretary Wilson on the subject of duplication as applied to this particular work and to this particular item which this committee has stricken out of the bill. If he be an authority for the committee to quote, they will surely accept him as eminently satisfactory when it comes to the specific thing under investigation here.

But to get before the Senate again in this connection the statement of the committee, as presented by a member of that committee, of the reasons which moved it, I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1917. There was a running discussion as to duplication between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. The Senator from Florida, reading from the report of the Secretary, on page 1857, says—and it is the first that I can find here that he did read from the report of the Secretary—

The law creating the Department of Labor provides—

“That the Secretary of Labor shall investigate and report to Congress a plan of coordination of the activities, duties, and powers of the office of the Secretary of Labor with the activities, duties, and powers of the present bureaus, commissions, and departments, so far as they relate to labor and its conditions, in order to harmonize and unify such activities, duties, and powers, with a view to further legislation to further define the duties and powers of such Department of Labor.”

Then the Senator comments as follows:

Here is a letter from the Secretary of Labor dated January 9, 1917, in which department the bureau is located, from which I quote to the Senator this paragraph:

“Another relationship, somewhat along the same line, exists with reference to the parallel activities of the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau. The nature of this overlapping in the same fields of endeavor is of such a character that there is practically no limit to the duplication and resultant likelihood of confusion, unless there is complete and harmonious adjustment of the respective activities.”

That is as far as the quotation extends until you come to page 1859, when the Senator continued his reading from the Secretary, as follows:

Mr. BRYAN. Let us see. I will read a little further from what the Secretary says. By the way, it develops another duplication when we come to read it. He says:

“One instance of distinct overlapping occurs in reference to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This circumstance appears to be due to the broad authority vested in the Public Health Service to investigate the ‘diseases of man and conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof’ (act approved Aug. 14, 1912; 37 Stat., 309). As the Bureau of Labor Statistics is charged with acquiring and diffusing useful information upon subjects connected with labor (act approved June 13, 1888; 25 Stat., 182), and as information regarding occupational diseases and the conditions influencing their propagation is clearly a subject connected with labor as well as with the general classification of the ‘diseases of man,’ the Bureau of Labor Statistics of this department and the Public Health Service of the Treasury Department are charged, at least to this extent, with similar duties. In order to prevent confusion and duplication of effort, coordination of the functions of these two branches of the public service should, in so far as they may overlap, be effected and consistently adhered to.”

“The field of occupational diseases was occupied during a period of about seven years prior to 1912 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, through its investigations into the hygienic conditions of cotton mills; of home work; of ventilation and general sanitary conditions of clothing shops; of diseases in the glass industry; of health of women in textile factories and laundries; of poisons in the industries; of tuberculosis among wage earners; of the health of wage-earning women in the pea canneries; of the hygiene of the painters' trade; of anthrax as an occupational disease, etc.”

“Since 1912 the Public Health Service has carried its function with reference to the diseases of man into the field of occupational diseases. It can not be conducive to the good of the service in general to have two such Government establishments occupying identically the same field at one and the same time—”

Nobody can quarrel with that criticism or observation, Mr. President. Everybody must agree to that. The difficulty is that Congress is responsible for this overlapping direction, and, as suggested by the Secretary, the different governmental activities have been obliged to protect themselves against squandering the public money by seeking, in so far as they could by conference, to limit the overlapping work and prevent duplication. He is making a general statement now, and says:

It can not be conducive to the good of the service in general to have two such Government establishments occupying identically the same field at one and the same time, and it would appear that in so far as the functions of the Public Health Service relate to labor and its conditions, as is the case with reference to occupational diseases, they should be correlated and coordinated with those of the Department of Labor. In their medical and scientific aspects occupational complaints should doubtless be within the field of the Public Health Service, but just as certainly they should be within the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor in their industrial bearing, this phase of the matter being popular rather than scientific, and tending to promote the welfare of the wage earners who are or may become subject to ailments peculiar to certain trades and occupations. The logical conclusion is that neither branch of the public service should be in absolute control with reference to investigating them and publishing the results. The concluding recommendation in this report will, if adopted, prevent any harmful overlapping of functions and result in the utilization to the

fullest extent of all such information and data that may be gathered for scientific and other purposes, so far as the same is useful in its more popular aspects.

And now we come to this, and the Senator reads the concluding paragraph:

Now we come to this:

"Another relationship, somewhat along the same line, exists with reference to the parallel activities of the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau. The nature of this overlapping in the same fields of endeavor is of such a character that there is practically no limit to the duplication and resultant likelihood of confusion, unless there is complete and harmonious adjustment of the respective activities.

"Under the terms of the statute authorizing the establishment of the Children's Bureau (act approved Apr. 9, 1912, 37 Stat., 79) it is especially directed to investigate the questions of infant mortality, the birth rate, dangerous occupations, and accidents and diseases of children. The authority to investigate these same matters is likewise vested in the Public Health Service by the act approved August 14, 1912 (37 Stat., 309), which broadly covers the entire field under the term 'diseases of man.' As previously indicated in another connection, the function now under discussion is exercised by the Children's Bureau in a popular sense rather than from a medical or scientific viewpoint, but the means of attaining the respective ends necessarily lie along the same lines, and, as in the case of the contact between the Public Health Service and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and between the latter and the Children's Bureau, there should be absolute and positive means of preventing harmful overlapping of effort, and securing to all concerned the benefit of cooperative work in a movement which, up to a certain point, occupies a common field of investigation.

"Still another relationship of the Public Health Service to the Department of Labor is found in the work of medical inspection of aliens under the immigration laws (act approved Feb. 20, 1907, 34 Stat., 898, sec. 17)."

That is all that was read, Senators, by the committee as a justification for striking out of the bill the appropriation for investigating infant mortality as prescribed by the law which created the bureau. I submit there is not a word in what Secretary Wilson says that justifies a construction such as has been put upon it by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, if either of these bureaus ought to be curtailed, cut down, and denied the opportunity to investigate the subject of infant mortality, surely it ought not to have been the bureau that specifically by law is authorized to do that work.

Mr. President, thinking that I might be called upon to speak on this subject on Friday afternoon, and feeling certain that the quotation read from the Secretary of Labor was not fairly subject to any such construction as had been put upon it by the committee, I telephoned to the Secretary of Labor and asked him to advise me with respect to this matter of the duplication of work, and I received a telegram from him. It came to me after the Senate had adjourned on Friday. I will read it to the Senate just as I received it, and also read a letter from him which is just now laid upon my desk, which I have not had the opportunity to read and which came to my office since I have been speaking:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1917.

HON. R. M. LA FOLLETTE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Replying to your inquiry, would say that there is no duplication of work in this department between the Children's Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. BRYAN. That is the Bureau of Labor Statistics?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; the Bureau of Labor Statistics. That is one of the things that was cited in the quotation.

Mr. BRYAN. No; the conflict or duplication is with the Public Health Service.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But you did not stop with that. You referred to the industrial statistics that were being gathered as being a duplication of something else that was being done.

Mr. BRYAN. I read from it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. This will stand for itself in the RECORD against what I have read from the report as you gave it. I shall begin again, Mr. President, because I should like it to be consecutive.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1917.

HON. R. M. LA FOLLETTE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Replying to your inquiry, would say that there is no duplication of work in this department between the Children's Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Through a departmental arrangement, no study is undertaken by either bureau where their authorizations meet without consulting with the other, so that while there may be similarity in reports because of the closely related authorization there is no duplication of work, nor is there any duplication of work between the Children's Bureau and the Bureau of Health in the study of infant mortality. The Children's Bureau is making intensive studies of infant mortality from the standpoint of popularizing methods of prevention, and the investigations have not included school hygiene but have been dealing with children in their home life and home surroundings. Nor do I know of any duplication of this work by any other bureau of the Government. The Children's Bureau study of infant mortality is concerned with social and economic, not medical, factors. It in no way duplicates the work of the Public Health Service. Its purpose was fully explained to the Public Health Service when the bureau began operation in the autumn of 1912, and the head of the Public Health Service stated to the chief of the Children's Bureau that the inquiry upon the lines proposed was new and would be valuable, and that the Public Health

Service had no purpose to undertake it. The Children's Bureau has cooperated with the Bureau of Education and the Public Health Service in a study of the feebleminded in Delaware. It has cooperated with the Census Bureau in carrying on a continuous campaign for better birth registration. It has cooperated with the Department of Agriculture by furnishing large numbers of publications on the care of children for circulation by the county agents of the Department of Agriculture.

The bureau's extended studies of child-welfare legislation, child-labor laws, and child-labor conditions, its reports upon mother's pension, birth registration, and baby-week campaigns are all in a field entirely its own. It has not overlapped. The Children's Bureau has been doing a splendid work in this line so far as its appropriation would permit, and I sincerely hope that Congress will grant the increase asked for in order that the work may be continued on a still more effective basis. It has been the policy of the department wherever there was a likelihood of authorizations overlapping, either within the department or with other departments, to consult with the departments interested in order to avoid so far as possible duplication, the result of which has been that, while the authorization of different bureaus may have overlapped, the work in the specific field of inquiry has not been duplicated.

W. B. WILSON, Secretary.

Mr. President, there has just been laid upon my desk the following memorandum. I may say that it is not volunteered by the Secretary. I brought to his attention this morning the discussion which had taken place on Thursday and Friday concerning this important item in the bill and asked him, urgently requested him, if he had anything supplemental to the telegram which he had sent me on Friday that I would be glad to receive it while the matter was still pending. There was laid upon my desk here just a moment ago the following, which I have not read but will read to the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 22, 1917.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Supplementing my telegram to you on Friday, I am inclosing you herewith memoranda relative to some elements of doubt expressed by several Senators in their discussion of the appropriation for the Children's Bureau.

I desire to reiterate the statement that this department has not undertaken an investigation or study of any subject under its jurisdiction that was likely to overlap the authorization of any other department or bureau of the Government without first consulting with the departments or bureaus interested and arranging to avoid duplication. The letter from which the Senator from Florida quotes includes the draft of a bill which seeks to enact into law the policies which this department has endeavored to put into practice by interdepartmental arrangement, and the clause which the Senator quotes simply asserts the possibility of duplication when mutual arrangement has not been entered into before the study is commenced.

Mr. President, it is entirely manifest that the matter quoted from here was written not with application to the subject directly under discussion here, but was written to enforce a recommendation of the Secretary for legislation that should prevent any duplication of authorizations by Congress. I repeat:

The letter from which the Senator from Florida quotes includes the draft of a bill which seeks to enact into law the policies which this department has endeavored to put into practice by interdepartmental arrangement, and the clause which the Senator quotes simply asserts the possibility of duplication when mutual arrangement has not been entered into before the study is commenced.

I know of no investigation or other work that has been undertaken by this department or any of its bureaus where the field had already been covered or was being covered by any other department or bureau of the Government.

Respectfully, yours,

W. B. WILSON,
Secretary.

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, I asked the Children's Bureau to send to my office just before I took the floor every publication, every report, every bulletin which it has. I have these in my office. I have not had an opportunity to look over these publications. I have here a memorandum with respect to these books, which I shall withhold until I have had a chance to look at them myself, and I shall not present them unless there should be occasion for further discussion of this subject upon my part. It may not be necessary for me to take the time of the Senate to present them. Let me say this: I looked at their titles; I glanced just at the introductions. I had in mind the law, and I never was more confident of any assertion that I made on the floor of the Senate in the 10 years that I have been a Member here than I am of this. There can be found no article, no publication, no bulletin, no report made by the Children's Bureau which is not made under the authority of the statute which created it or amendments thereof. They have kept so specifically and so exactly within the terms of the authorizations of Congress that that bureau is not and can not be subject to any fair criticism by anybody.

I thank the Senate for its attention.

Mr. LANE. Before the Senator from Wisconsin takes his seat I wish to call his attention to a case which occurred within half a mile of where we now stand, since the argument began upon this bill. About the time we took up this item a woman was found by some of her neighbors lying in bed, holding a baby a few days old, who had not had a bite to eat for three

days, with no food in her house and no fuel with which to cook food if she had had it, nor to warm the premises. The baby was lying with her in bed, nursing a starving mother while her milk was drying in her breast, the baby to be stunted to that extent throughout life perhaps. Is there no need for a bureau to investigate conditions of that sort? There is no need to withhold this appropriation with the millions that are flooded down the line for useless expenditures.

There was another case near by where a woman with three children, who works for the Government for \$20 a month, fainted on her way home the other day and had to be carried into a neighbor's house. For the children she had denied herself food. That is the work for which we need such a bureau as this. Children raised under those conditions become derelict adults, unfit to take care of themselves or to do the duty devolving upon them, or which should devolve upon them, in carrying on government.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I promise to consume only a very short time, for I apprehend the Senate is anxious to get to a vote on this matter as speedily as possible.

The House Appropriations subcommittee in its hearings had presented to it an estimate by the Children's Bureau asking an appropriation of \$173,400 in the first instance. This is the second item found on page 143 of the bill now before the Senate as it came from the other House. The House subcommittee—and subsequently by the action of the House in passing the bill it was approved—out of the \$173,400 asked granted \$95,000 for those items. In that form the bill came to the Senate, whose committee reported to cut the \$95,000 down to \$58,000, leaving it in the form in which it has been reported. The appropriation of \$58,000 refers to various items of "traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4" pay for interpreters, and various other lines of effort mentioned in that paragraph. The Senate committee has reported to cut the \$95,000 allowed by the other House to \$58,000. With this reduction I am not in sympathy. I believe the House appropriation of \$95,000 ought to be restored. I believe it is as little as the efficient work of this branch of the bureau's service can be performed for.

As the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has fully covered the original act creating the bureau, I shall do no more than refer to it. The act under which this bureau was created imposes upon the head of the bureau and its subordinates the duty of investigating infant mortality. If the item, at the top of page 143, of \$72,120 be stricken out in accordance with the recommendations of the committee in reporting the bill, it leaves just so much of the duty of this bureau incapable of performance.

I assume that in the effort to economize these reductions have been made. This is an improper place for economy. If there is to be economy practiced in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, there are other and more fitting places on which that practice can be had. There is a multitude of public buildings, which have been frequently referred to here to-day, carrying many millions of dollars, in remote hamlets of little income and less importance, and which will be a fixed charge after the buildings shall have been erected, the maintenance cost of which will absorb a large portion of the postal receipts at those points, if not all of them. There is a river and harbor bill coming on apace, drawing with it the usual items from far and near, the meritorious being mixed with those that are without merit, aggregating many millions of dollars.

In addition to that, there is a great variety of other appropriations here on which we could well practice our economy. There is the usual mileage item presented through the legislative subdivision of this bill. There is \$51,000 in a single item for the mileage of Senators; there is \$175,000 in the mileage for Members of the other House, aggregating a total of \$226,000, over a quarter of a million dollars of mileage on the 10-cent provision that remains from an ancient day when we traveled by stage coach or in some other more expensive way than the usual 2 cents or less per mile attendant upon the travel of public officials at this time. I only refer to those instances to show that items of economy have been overlooked that could properly be stricken out of the various appropriation bills.

In the act creating the bureau having charge of children and kindred subjects duties are imposed upon that bureau and its authority is defined at some length. Those duties can not be performed unless there are adequate appropriations to that end. For the investigation of infant mortality every dollar of appropriation is stricken out under the report of the committee. How can that duty be performed? The reply is that there would be duplication of other services; that other departments and other lines of governmental effort cover the service of this item of \$72,120, which has been stricken out. I think the

testimony offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin on this point is pertinent and well nigh conclusive.

Among a good many other lines of work that the bureau performs is that of examining State laws, of examining the effect of local regulations upon the industrial and health conditions attendant on child labor and upon infants before they could even reach that age; upon the indexing of the laws and making them accessible to the general public, so that they will not be to that public a sealed book.

From Chicago comes a letter from S. C. Kingsley, which is found published in the hearings before the subcommittee of the other House. Sherman C. Kingsley, of Chicago, is a gentleman who is engaged in charitable and eleemosynary work. He has been in that business practically all his life. It was my fortune to be associated with him for four years in one branch of the service where some of my public duty came in contact with his. Mr. Kingsley is not given to spending money uselessly. He is reasonable in his expenditures, because the greater part of his activities have been under private charity, under the foundations created by a will, where great funds had been accumulated, which are administered upon strictly business principles, and where they cooperate in a practical way with the public charities of the State and of the General Government; in the administration of the affairs of these great foundations, the great bulk of which have to do with the large cities of this country, where a great part of the industrial problems have their origin; and in the course of his activities he has been able to inform himself concerning these matters. I only give this as explanatory of who S. C. Kingsley is. Addressing a letter to the head of the Children's Bureau, Miss Julia Lathrop, under date line "Chicago, Ill., November 21, 1916," he says:

MY DEAR MISS LATHROP: I thank you very much for your letter and for the index of Illinois laws relating to child welfare, which has been received. We are just getting fairly into the work here and begin to appreciate something of what it means to have a service of this kind rendered by the Federal Government. I am sure that this index will be of the greatest possible service. One can see at a glance that this kind of thing can not be done by a casual group or by an office that was not organized for the purpose.

About a week ago, Mr. President, an examination by medical authority of 86,000 school children in the city of Chicago was completed. These children had passed the infant stage, and, having reached school age, were found in the schools of that city. Of the 86,000 children, who were examined by competent medical authority, 29,000, nearly one-half, were found physically defective. According to the military records of various enlistment stations of this country, it is reported as the result of medical examinations that an unusually and dangerously large percentage of the applicants are rejected for physical defects. It is known that the public health is impaired; it is known that for some cause there are more physical defectives in the present generation of Americans than are either safe or necessary. Where shall we begin? A celebrated authority once said "Begin with the grandfather." We can not. In considering the mortality incident to infant life it is too late to begin with the grandfather; we can only take the little sparks of human life that have been sent into this world and that are entitled to their chance to live. We can begin with them; we can supervise their tiny lives; we can improve their surroundings; we can give the mother medical instruction, advice, and help; we can send into the hovel or into the humble home where the baby of yesterday is lying without care the information and the knowledge to the parents, however poor, that will give the infant the chance to live. We can do those things; but we can not turn back the hands of the clock to the grandfather's time.

For the 29,000 children examined in Chicago and found to be physically defective, we are responsible either in our State Government or here in this Capitol. When children reach the school age and are physically defective at that early time, while they are still growing, while their vitality is in the ascendancy, it may fairly be inferred that if during the age of infancy, before they left the mother's bosom or the nursing bottle or the cradle, they had had proper care, as contemplated by this item of this bill, nearly half of the number examined would not have been physically defective.

We think we are a progressive people. We are progressing backwards. In this modern generation our people are eating finely bolted flour, canned vegetables, preserved meat, and food in tabloid form, unripe fruits or too little of any kind, with a careless diet, and large populations are gathering in great industrial centers in the mighty cities springing up on the continent, until we are rotting at the sources, and there is scarcely a physically perfect child 12 years of age to be found in New York, Chicago, Cleveland, St. Louis, Kansas City, or any other of the large cities of our country. Their teeth are chalk, their nerves are destroyed, they are prematurely old,

they are toothless at 20, they are hairless at 30, they are nervous wrecks at 40, and they are dead and forgotten at 50. Something is the matter. Let us begin with the babies we have got now, and take care, so far as our example and our ability go, of the generation to come, or the second one to come, reaching ahead by our example into the future the best we can by doing our duty now.

I was amused a few days ago when reading an article on eugenics, a news report by Mr. Stokes. I hesitate somewhat to give Mr. Stokes the publicity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the item deserves, but Mr. Stokes in substance suggested the breeding of human beings as he has been raising horses. Well, with all due respect, there is a difference between a human being and a horse. A human being is supposed to be something besides mere body and beyond physical brawn. The provision under consideration here is not merely for the purpose of watching the physical health and to make some kind of a habitation for a healthy person in the future, but it is to give the foundation, so that there may be future training to some advantage.

The people that have gone a long way on eugenics remind me of the melancholy experience of Mr. Frankenstein. You will remember that Shelley, the poet Byron, and others—five of them altogether—agreed that they would each write an impossible story. It was to be wholly a product of the imagination. It was not to be based upon fact, but was to be based upon the ingenious theorizing of the author. They carried out the compact, and but one of the productions has survived—Frankenstein. The author succeeded in creating a mortal without the aid of the ordinary agencies. He was physically immune from disease, impervious to cold, tireless in his activities, without fatigue, a giant in muscle, and unconquerable in personal prowess and individual combat. He was ungovernable. The author created a perfect being physically, but without moral sensibilities or moral character, so he became a scourge and a curse and a menace to communities.

We are not seeking to do anything of the kind. We are seeking to preserve the physical body of the infant, not by a system of eugenics that will select the mate without regard to human affections, but to preserve the infant born under ordinary conditions and give it the physical body that may be the foundation of the character that is to govern that body in the years to come.

That is the purpose of the \$72,120. It is to investigate infant mortality. The figures read by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are unanswerable. The mortality investigated shows the cause of the mortality. Study the life-insurance tables—the American table of mortality or the early English table of mortality. One hundred thousand infants are taken, or 100,000 persons at a given age. How many live at the end of each twelve-months period? You get infant mortality in the same way. Out of the given number of infants, a thousand or ten thousand, each year so many are dead. As the indifference and neglect and sordid surroundings and careless living of the parent or guardian, the lack of sanitation in the home, increase, the infant mortality increases. Death reaps his harvest where there is the least known about how to take care of the child.

It is to stop that untimely harvest, the swath cut by infant diseases as it sweeps through the home of the humble, that this investigation is designed. Its purpose is humanitarian; its methods are practical; its results are certain; and for one, Mr. President, I shall vote to restore the House item. That is as far as we can go. We can not add to the House bill under present conditions; but we can at least, in the exercise of our right, restore the amount allowed by the House, which is entirely stricken out, on this subject of infant mortality and partially stricken out on the other expenses incident to this branch of the public service.

I do not care to take further time, Mr. President. Although it is an inviting subject, and one that leads to the investigation of a great many things of an economic character, of humanitarian consideration, and of the administration of both public and private charity, I forbear by reason of lack of time, leaving to some more opportune occasion the pursuit of other branches of this subject, which are multitudinous in character and vital in their ultimate consequences.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay action upon this amendment. I should be false to myself, however, if I did not enter a protest against the attempted action of the committee.

I think we have had or will have before us few matters equaling in importance this question. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] has well said that we can not begin with the grandfather; but we can to-day, by beginning with the infant, deal with the grandfather of the generations to come.

There can be no question in free government so vital as the upbuilding of the citizen. It has been urged here that we need a strong childhood from which to develop a strong manhood; that we may have the manhood essential upon the field of battle. But, Mr. President, in a republic we need a patriot behind and preceding the soldier; and we can not develop that love of our institutions, that character essential to the highest ideals of citizenship, if we begin with a weak and degenerate physical condition of the child. So that while we need the strong, if we ever do, upon the field of battle, we need the strong still more back of the soldier himself. No nation ever went down on the field of battle until the seeds of weakness and decay had been sown in the citizenship.

Mr. President, I would go one step further with this appropriation. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] this afternoon has portrayed in most graphic manner a lessening appreciation—and it is becoming more and more evident every day in this land—of the value and the spirit of our institutions among those who find the struggle of life a hard struggle. We owe them something, not alone in relieving their physical distress, but in building up in their hearts and minds a love for the institutions under which they live. When we squander hundreds of millions preparing to do battle, on the theory that the graveyards of Europe will give up their dead to stand in battle array, it is no wonder that these upon whom rests the burden of the industrial life of our country come to a lessened appreciation of the spirit of our institutions.

Mr. President, to my mind there is but one excuse on earth for free government, and that is that in the association thus formed those who form the association may gain in material and moral welfare; and government owes a duty to its citizens to inspire in them a confidence and respect for their institutions.

It is said that this is providing more clerks than may be needed for this bureau. I am not certain upon that point one way or the other; but I believe it is unfortunate that the committee takes this point as the point from which to project a system of economy in the appropriations of this Congress, dealing with this great problem, dealing with humanity, dealing with the question of building up in the minds of our people a love and reverence for our institutions. I believe that we can well afford to take the chances upon the possibility that we may provide here for a few more clerks than will be absolutely necessary; and it seems to me that taking this broader view of the situation it is unfortunate indeed that the committee has recommended the striking out of this small item put in the bill by the House.

I did not intend, and do not intend now, to trespass on the time of the Senate. I simply wanted to deal with this broader phase of the subject.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I shall not reply to many of the things said by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. They are matters in which the Senate is not concerned. The Senate is not concerned with entering into the question of the motives of individual Senators. Neither do I believe that the Senators who have discussed this question understand what is involved.

I concede that the gentleman who offered the amendment in the House was very shrewd in the language given to his amendment. The head of this bureau did not ask for any money to investigate the subject of infant mortality. That question was not mentioned in the official estimates that came to the House committee; neither was it involved in the language of the bill that was submitted when it was before the House committee.

Let me say right here that it is rather a strange proceeding for the heads of these bureaus to have their hearings before the House committee, get a part of the increase they desire, and then turn in against the committee before the House membership and get some more; then come to the Senate committee and plead for more, and if they get it, pocket that, and then come to the Senate and fight the Senate committee.

They did not ask for any money to investigate the subject of infant mortality. That idea came as a bright thought from some Member of the House who offered this amendment. Here is what they asked for, and the way it would have read if the money asked for by the head of this department had been granted by the House Committee:

Chief of [the Children's] bureau, \$5,000; assistant chief of bureau, \$4,000; experts—1 on sanitation, \$2,800; 1 industrial, \$2,000; 1 social service, \$2,000; 1 librarian, \$2,000; 1 statistical, \$2,000; 1 research, \$2,000; special agents—1 at \$1,800, 4 at \$1,600 each, 15 at \$1,400 each, 20 at \$1,200 each; private secretary to chief of bureau, \$1,500; clerks—1 administrative, \$2,000, 5 of class 4, 8 of class 3, 11 of class 2, 25 of class 1, 27 at \$1,000 each; 5 copyists; messenger; and assistant messenger; in all, \$178,760.

In other words, they asked for nothing more than an increase in the clerical force amounting to 57 individuals; they asked

to increase their annual appropriation from \$100,000 to \$178,760; and the House committee and the Senate committee declined to do it.

"Ah," say the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] and other Senators, "but we might have found some other place to economize." The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] points out that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] voted against the bill creating the Children's Bureau when it was established. Yes; I voted against it on the ground that it was unnecessary; that there were bureaus enough. Now it develops that the bureaus are doing the work two or three times over, and I believe I was justified in it.

The Senator points out also that I voted against the child-labor bill. So I did. He and I both had grave doubts about its constitutionality. He said he had, and I said I had. In that situation I thought I ought not to vote for it, and the Senator from Iowa thought he was permitted, under his oath, to vote for it.

Mr. President, this is not the only bureau that did not get what it asked for. It was given the same appropriation that it had last year. Every other bureau was treated in about the same way.

The Library of Congress asked for 43 more clerks—less numbers—and got only 1, I believe.

The Civil Service Commission asked for 10 more clerks at a cost of \$12,490. They were not allowed. Does it, therefore, follow that the Committee on Appropriations is trying to put the Civil Service Commission out of business?

The Department of State asked for an appropriation of \$15,000 for emergency clerical service on account of the Mexican situation. The committee did not give it to them. Does that justify any Senator from any State in impugning the motives of any committee?

The Secretary of the Treasury asked for some increases for his department. I voted for an assistant to the Secretary, because I think he is almost compelled to have one because of the added work placed upon him. Some Senator raised the point of order here, and it went out. He asked for two more clerks and some more appropriations, and they were not allowed. In the Treasury Department I find, again, that they asked for 64 clerks. The Treasury Department is a great department. They were not asking for any more increase of clerks in the whole department than are asked for here in one bureau. Is not the Treasury Department an important department of this Government? We thought they could get along without it, however, and we did not increase their appropriation.

In the Office of the Coast Guard they needed five clerks, at a cost of \$6,000. They were not allowed. I shall not take time to go through all the list. The same thing was true of the War Department, the Navy Department, the Interior Department, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Commerce. All the departments of the Government, including the bureaus therein, seemed to be satisfied, except one bureau in the Department of Labor, because we treated them all alike, and because the committee was trying to carry out the mandate of the Democrats, at least in this body. We have had here for three hours speeches pointing out that the committee has refused to allow these people to continue the work upon infant mortality when they have the same amount of money for the next year that they have had for this year.

The Secretary of Labor, who, in pursuance of an act of Congress, wrote this letter January 9, sends to the Senator from Wisconsin a telegram on the 19th of January. I shall not undertake to say what he meant. If the Secretary can himself write this on the 9th and say what he said to the Senator on the 19th and make them harmonize, that is for him. The Senator from Wisconsin could not do it.

Mr. President, we left all the departments, so far as I am able to recall, with the same clerical force they have this year. There was a recommendation for one increase for the Secretary of the Treasury and that went out on a point of order. It is not fair, it is not just, it is not true to charge the Senate committee with undertaking to discriminate against one particular bureau. I think it speaks better for the rest of them that they submit, while the head of this bureau, or somebody connected with it, holds the Senate up here for days, appealing to the Senate on the theory and with the implied charge that the committee were following them up and trying to punish them and starving them to death. The committee had no such idea. The committee thought that with what they had allowed they could get along. The committee thought within the next year, in pursuance of the authority partially granted them and in pursuance of the authority that will be asked for in this bill, we can cut out this duplication. The report can be published now by the

Health Service and by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and that bureau can continue on as it is. We thought that the reports should be made without at this time doubling the clerical force of the Children's Bureau.

Many pictures have been printed here to-day, Mr. President, of conditions in various parts of the country. Most of them can not be cured by learned pamphlets on infant mortality. These people would sit at desks in this city and write learned pamphlets and send them to the boards of health of States that have a superior force and know more about what they are doing than these people when they try to tell them.

I am ready for a vote, so far as I am concerned. I shall not take up the time of the Senate in answering any three or four hours' speech, which is an attack upon the Committee on Appropriations, and especially upon myself and the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, it is very evident, I think, that we can not get a quorum this afternoon.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; we can.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not think so.

Mr. CLAPP and Mr. RANSDELL. Let us try.

Mr. KENYON. I suggest to the Senator from North Carolina if we could have a yea-and-nay vote, that would take the place of calling for a quorum.

Mr. OVERMAN. I thought that perhaps we might have unanimous consent to vote not later than 12 o'clock to-morrow on this particular item.

Mr. KENYON. I am perfectly willing to do that, but I think we can vote now.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Let us vote now.

Mr. WATSON. Why not vote now?

Mr. OVERMAN. All right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate simply a few words. The estimate made for the appropriations for the next fiscal year in the departments was \$42,000,000. The Senate have reduced the appropriations not in one bureau or in one department, but in every department and every bureau. We have given them less than they estimated for. So the bill carries \$39,000,000. That is not counting the salaries. We have been cutting in every department and every bureau of the Government, thinking that they ought to get along with the same amount that they got along with last year; that is, in every bureau except one—the Census, probably. We had to increase that because the law requires them to take the marriage and divorce census next year, and we had to make that appropriation. If it had not been required by law, we would not have given that. I do not believe we have increased a single salary in the service of the Government. We did create one office, an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, which we think the Secretary of the Treasury ought to have, but it was ruled out on a point of order.

The Librarian of Congress asked for a very large increase, and we gave them one increase of \$900.

The Department of State asked for a very large sum, and we gave them an increase of only \$3,600. To the Treasury Department we gave an increase of only \$8,000, and we cut them down tens of thousands of dollars; and so on with every bureau in every department of the Government.

We cut down this appropriation because the Children's Bureau are doing this work now. In the last year they have been collecting infant mortality statistics. They are doing it now, and we expect them to get along with the very same sum that they are getting this year. It is no time to grant an increase, especially when they did not ask us for a single dollar. They do not ask us for a single dollar to take this census of infant mortality. That was done on the floor of the House. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives did not give them this appropriation. Why? Because they said they had enough money to go on with. The Member of the House who introduced the amendment used this language; and it is not the language of Secretary Wilson and it is not the language of Miss Lathrop or anybody else's language.

As the Senator from Florida explained, what did they ask for? They have 73 clerks and they asked for 57 more clerks. Why did they ask for them? They did not ask for any money to continue this work, yet all this speech has been made here for three hours this evening to the effect that they want to go on with taking the census of infant mortality in this country. They do not put it upon that ground at all. Therefore, we did not think it was the time, with the condition of the Treasury of the United States staring us in the face, to deal with this bureau otherwise than we deal with every other department in the Government. We have dealt in the same way with every

other department in the Government, and we have refused increases to the amount of \$2,600,000 in all the departments. That was the reason of our action, and not to cripple anybody. They ought to get along with the same amount of money they got along with the current year, and that is what we gave them.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate for more than a moment. What little I shall say will be in justification of the vote that I shall cast upon this item.

No one believes more than I in the preservation of child life, and I would not measure it in dollars and cents. I would not hesitate even under the present condition of the Treasury to appropriate money if it were necessary and for that purpose.

But, Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations heard not only the head of this bureau testify as to what was wanted, but it also studied the testimony which was given before the Appropriation Committee of the House. Not only that, but it took into consideration the estimates that were submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury, as required by law, before taking the action that it did.

Mr. President, I have the wording as contained in those estimates. The estimates state just what the bureau wanted and what the money was to be appropriated for. The language that was adopted on the floor of the House is not the language suggested by any member of the bureau, nor is it in the estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury. What the appropriation was wanted for is contained in the estimate and discussed in the House hearings at page 506:

CHILDREN'S BUREAU.
[House hearings, p. 506.]

Estimated new and omitted:	
1 expert on research	\$2,000
5 special agents, at \$1,400 each	7,000
8 special agents, at \$1,200 each	9,600
1 administrative clerk	2,000
3 clerks of class 4, at \$1,800 each	5,400
4 clerks of class 3, at \$1,600 each	6,400
6 clerks of class 2, at \$1,400 each	8,400
7 clerks of class 1, at \$1,200 each	8,400
17 clerks, at \$1,000 each	17,000
4 copyists, at \$900 each	3,600
1 assistant messenger	720
57 Total	70,520

That is what the estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury contained. That is what was asked from the House Appropriations Committee and refused by that committee. That is what was presented to your committee and asked by the head of the bureau.

I want the Senate also to understand that there was another item which was presented not only to the House but to the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The request is found in the House hearings on page 507, and is the only request made for an appropriation for the child-welfare survey, that we have heard so much about. The request that was made and considered by the House Committee on Appropriations and refused is as follows:

CHILDREN'S BUREAU—CONTINGENT EXPENSES.
[House hearings, p. 507.]

* * * expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of members of societies and associations when authorized by the Secretary of Labor; employment of a supervisor of child-welfare surveys, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$3,500 per annum; experts for child-welfare surveys, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$2,500 per annum; assistants for child-welfare surveys, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$1,200 per annum; experts and temporary assistants, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$8 a day; interpreters, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$4 a day when actually employed; rental and equipment of rooms for temporary field quarters, including care of same, furniture, and telephone service; temporary clerks and stenographers in the District of Columbia, to be selected from the civil-service registers and to be paid at the rate of not exceeding \$100 per month, the same person to be employed for not more than 6 consecutive months, the total expenditure for such temporary clerical assistance in the District of Columbia not to exceed \$5,000.

* * * and for the purchase of materials for exhibits and conferences, and the rental and equipment of a demonstration car * * *. That was asked for under the head of contingent expenses. The hearings were held before the Appropriations Committee of the House and the request was denied. No one offered the amendment upon the floor of the House. This is the provision, if you desire to appropriate for child welfare, that ought to have been included in the bill, and not the amendment adopted in the House. That is one reason why the Committee on Appropriations acted as they did. The committee allowed the amounts that were appropriated for last session, as stated by the Senator from North Carolina, and it cut out the amendment that was adopted in the House, because that provided for clerks, amounting to 57 in all.

Mr. TOWNSEND. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TOWNSEND. In case the House provision is retained by the Senate, can any portion of the money so appropriated be used for child-welfare work, of which we have heard so much?

Mr. SMOOT. I could not say exactly whether it could or not, although I think under the language it could be used for child welfare. I do not know how far that would go. Nor do I understand to what extent it could be used for that purpose. I will say to the Senator that I very much prefer, if we are going to have any change at all, the language as it was provided in the estimates.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The reason why I rose was that I had not heard the point made which the Senator has just made. My sympathy with this increased appropriation exists because of the fact that it could be used for the purposes which have been mentioned; but if it can not be so used, and the department has not asked for any extra appropriation for the other work, it seems to me that the committee is absolutely right. If, however, it is necessary to change this amendment so that it can be applied to the particular object which Senators have in mind, I think it should be done.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator. I will say that the department have asked for these 57 extra clerks; they designate the classes of clerks they desire and state just exactly what salaries they are to receive. That was disagreed to by the committee of the other House, and the proposition was never offered as an amendment upon the floor of the House. The question of the increased number of clerks was not considered, nor did the committee of the Senate consider it, because of the fact it had disregarded any claim for increase in the number of clerks or any increase of the salary of clerks in all of the departments of the Government.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment, and then I will yield to the Senator.

I wish further to say to the Senator from Michigan that I know there have been clerks asked for in the other departments that should have been allowed; but, as I have said, the policy decided upon by the majority members of the committee was not to allow any additional clerks nor to allow any increases of salaries. That is the reason the committee did not allow any of the 57 clerks to this bureau. In addition to that, the committee in the House of Representatives, after discussing the question and after holding hearings upon it, refused to grant the increase of clerks.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Let me finish what I was about to say. Then, do I understand that the increased appropriation made by the House of Representatives was for the purpose of covering the expenditure which would be required by the allowance of these 57 additional clerks?

Mr. SMOOT. All I can say is, that it will be used for that purpose if the original request made by the department is agreed to. Under the wording of the amendment, I can not say what they will use the money for; but I will say to the Senator that it is the same amount asked for with which to pay these 57 additional clerks.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator say there was a discussion of this question in the other House as to the increase of the number of clerks, and that it was defeated?

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator from Iowa misunderstood me. I said there was a discussion in the committee, not in the House.

Mr. KENYON. A point of order would lie in the House against the increased number of clerks.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. KENYON. Hence the wording that appears in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Iowa is correct; but he misunderstood me if he thought that I said the matter was discussed on the floor of the House. I said that it was discussed in the committee of the House.

Mr. CLARK. Is this the exact amount which was asked for by the bureau?

Mr. SMOOT. It is, within just a few dollars.

Mr. President, I have been in sympathy with the work of this bureau. I have seen some of the effects from its labors, but I have not been in sympathy with the overlapping and duplication of this work. For four or five years we have called attention to this very matter upon the floor of the Senate, but somehow or other there is no diminution whatever in the appropriations for the Public Health Service for its work, and

now the educational department is issuing bulletins upon the same subject.

As I said the other day, that there is a duplication of work there can be no question. If there were some way of amending this bill so as to prevent any other department of the Government from doing the same work—for I recognize its importance and know that the work ought to be done—I believe that such an amendment ought to be made, for I do not know how we are going to stop a duplication unless some definite action to that end is taken by the Senate of the United States.

When the sundry civil bill comes into the Senate I will undertake to state now that there will be an appropriation contained in it for the Public Health Service that will be expended for this exact work, and I think the Appropriations Committee ought to take it up and see that there is an end to duplication of all activities of the Government. I am perfectly willing that this bureau should do the work; it is not that on which my objection is based, for, as I said before, the work ought to be done; but, Mr. President, it does seem to me that we ought to call a halt somewhere to the duplication of work that is going on.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the question with me is this: If this appropriation is passed, will this particular bureau do this work, and would the money be used for this purpose?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It could not be used for any other purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. All I can say is that I do not know whether this appropriation will be used by the bureau for the employment of 57 clerks or not. That, however, is what they ask for; but I will not take the responsibility of saying for what it will be used. I want to be perfectly frank about the matter.

Mr. KENYON. But the Senator will not say that it will not be used for that purpose, will he?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I will not.

Mr. KENYON. And the chief of the bureau has stated that it will be used for this work, and that ought to be enough.

Mr. SMOOT. I said I would not say that it would not be used for that purpose. All I say is that, so far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned, the only thing it had to take into consideration was the employment of 57 extra clerks asked for, and this was denied by the committee. This amendment was adopted on the floor of the House, and we thought—and I believe we were justified in so thinking as a committee—that this appropriation simply covered the payment of the 57 extra clerks asked for.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WORKS. Does the Senator know whether it was claimed that in order to do this work it was necessary to increase the clerical force? What was the reason given for desiring to increase the clerical force?

Mr. SMOOT. Among other things mentioned, this particular work was pointed out as being necessary.

Mr. WORKS. The result will be that most of the money will go for the payment of extra clerks.

Mr. SMOOT. If the money is used for the purpose that they stated they wanted it used for and the purpose the estimates call for, there will be no question but that it will be used for the payment of the 57 extra clerks. I do not know what the 57 clerks are going to be assigned to do. It is stated exactly of what classes the clerks shall be, but what they are going to do is not stated. I will say, however, that there are no salaries for doctors asked for. I have also heard it stated—although I am not positive whether it is true or not, for I have not investigated it—that the Children's Bureau has assigned to it, upon the request of the head of the bureau, certain physicians from the Public Health Service to do a great deal of this special work.

Mr. WORKS. I want to ask whether it was stated that the persons named to do the work are experts, or if they are simply ordinary clerks?

Mr. SMOOT. The estimates covered:

One expert on research, \$2,000; 5 special agents, at \$1,400 each; 8 special agents, at \$1,200 each; 1 administrative clerk, \$2,000; 3 clerks of class 4, at \$1,800 each; 4 clerks of class 3, at \$1,600 each; 6 clerks of class 2, at \$1,400 each; 7 clerks of class 1, at \$1,200 each; 17 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 4 copyists, at \$900 each; 1 assistant messenger, \$720.

Mr. WORKS. If I knew what a "special agent" meant, I would be informed.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, I can not inform the Senator, for I do not know what they would be called upon to do.

Now, Mr. President, I wanted to say this much in justification of the position that was taken by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. I believe that the other members feel as I do, although I have never heard them express themselves as I have done this afternoon. No Senator and no other person is more interested in child life, their care and protection, than am I. I do not want to withhold from this bureau a single cent that is necessary; but it seems to me, Mr. President, from

the hearings that were had, that these 57 employees asked for would not assist in extending that particular work. It may be so, although there is nothing in the testimony, so far as I have seen, that would justify that conclusion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. Observing that he is absent and not being able to make a transfer, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] and vote "nay."

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON]. In his absence I refrain from voting. Were I at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If I were privileged to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLE], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY], but as I understand he would vote as I am about to vote, I feel at liberty to vote, and therefore vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LANE. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is absent on official business.

Mr. TILLMAN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote "yea."

Mr. LIPPITT. I inquire whether the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. LIPPITT. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "nay."

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to inquire whether the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. DU PONT. As I have a general pair with that Senator, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—17.

Bankhead	Overman	Smoot	Williams
Bryan	Ransdell	Stone	Works
Fletcher	Robinson	Thomas	
Gallinger	Smith, Ga.	Tillman	
Hitchcock	Smith, S. C.	Warren	

NAYS—31.

Ashurst	James	Myers	Sterling
Borah	Jones	Norris	Thompson
Brandegee	Kenyon	Page	Townsend
Clark	La Follette	Phelan	Vardaman
Cummins	Lane	Poindexter	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lippitt	Pomerene	Watson
Hollis	McLean	Sheppard	Weeks
Husting	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—48.

Beckham	Culberson	Harding	Lee, Md.
Brady	Dillingham	Hardwick	Lewis
Broussard	du Pont	Hughes	Lodge
Catron	Fall	Johnson, Me.	McCumber
Chamberlain	Fernald	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin, Va.
Chilton	Goff	Kern	Nelson
Clapp	Gore	Kirby	Newlands
Colt	Gronna	Lea, Tenn.	O'Gorman

Oliver
Owen
Penrose
Pittman

Reed
Saulsbury
Shafroth
Smith

Simmons
Smith, Ariz.
Smith, Md.
Smith, Mich.

Sutherland
Swanson
Underwood
Walsh

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the question of agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee the yeas are 17 and the nays are 31. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] are in the Chamber and paired. The amendment is rejected.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is, on page 143, line 9, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "\$8" and insert "\$6."

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Senate has passed on this matter, and it can do as it pleases about this item. We struck out \$8 a day and made it \$6. That is about all it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it. The ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the next amendment is really a part of what we have been considering for two or three days, and there was a sort of understanding that it should follow the previous vote. I ask the Senator from North Carolina if that is not correct?

Mr. OVERMAN. I stated that if the Senate should strike out these four lines at the top of page 143 I should make no contest whatever about these related matters; the Senate could do as it pleased.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is, on page 143, line 21, where it is proposed to strike out "\$95,000" and to insert "\$58,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is, on page 151, where the committee amendment proposes to strike out lines 5 to 20, inclusive, being section 7, in the following words:

SEC. 7. That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum less than \$1,200, and for increased compensation at the rate of 5 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate not more than \$1,800 per annum and not less than \$1,200 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to the employees who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator having the bill in charge that that amendment will lead to a great deal of debate. It seems to me there is no necessity of starting with the consideration of it to-night.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SMOOT. Why not adjourn now?

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to get unanimous consent first that we shall meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 685).

Mr. STONE. I ask unanimous consent to submit a short order for immediate consideration.

The order was read, as follows:

Ordered, That the address of the President of the United States delivered to the Senate to-day be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that 25,000 copies thereof be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the adoption of the order?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to object at all to the printing of the address, but it seems to me that under the law an order involving expense must go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I should like to ask the Chair if this order falls within that category? Of course, if it does it will have to go to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no idea as to how the expense of printing is paid.

Mr. FLETCHER. Allow me to suggest that under the order of the Senate the address may be printed as a public document without any reference.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not alone what this is, I will say to the Senator. If it was simply to print the address as a public document there would be no question about it. The order does not provide that it shall be printed as a public document, but that the address shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and that 25,000 copies of it shall be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER. As a public document.

Mr. STONE. As a Senate document.

Mr. SMOOT. The only question in my mind is whether, being an order and carrying an expenditure, it ought not to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest that the Senator from Missouri simply means to have the address printed as a public document and that 25,000 copies be printed.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, if that is his request, then I do not object at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. The estimate of the cost is about \$116.

Mr. SMOOT. I would not object to that.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is within the Senate limit.

Mr. STONE. That is what I do request. That the address be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the order? The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, since neither of the Senators from Nebraska is here, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 23, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, January 22, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art ever present; an immanent God; working in and through the material and spiritual realms; creating, recreating; transmitting, transforming; moving ever onward to larger life and nobler achievements; make us susceptible to Thy holy influence, that with pure conceptions and high ideals we may be the instruments in Thy hands for the furtherance of Thy plans and purposes; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 20, 1917, was read and approved.

ELECTION CONTESTS—BROWN V. HICKS.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Elections No. 3 to present a unanimous report (No. 1326) in the contested-election case of Brown against Hicks, and to move the adoption of the resolutions which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the resolutions (H. Res. 462), as follows:

Resolved, That Lathrop Brown was not elected Representative to the Sixty-fourth Congress from the first congressional district of New York.

Resolved, That Frederick C. Hicks was elected a Representative to the Sixty-fourth Congress from the first congressional district of New York, and he is entitled to retain his seat therein.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were agreed to.

CANTOR V. SIEGEL.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am also directed by the Committee on Elections No. 3 to present a unanimous report (No. 1325) of the committee in the case of Cantor against Siegel, and I move the adoption of the resolutions which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the resolutions (H. Res. 461), as follows:

Resolved, That Jacob A. Cantor was not elected a Representative to the Sixty-fourth Congress from the twentieth congressional district of New York.

Resolved, That Isaac Siegel was elected a Representative to the Sixty-fourth Congress from the twentieth congressional district of New York, and is entitled to retain his seat therein.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolutions.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were agreed to.

MILITARY PREPARATION.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one moment upon the subject of citizens' aid to military preparation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a number of gentlemen of the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, whose names stand for a great deal in the business and industrial life of that city and State, many of whom have been connected either with the Army or the National Guard, have with a great deal of thought and labor evolved a most excellent system whereby the citizen may be of very great aid in the preparation for military defense, should such defense ever be required on the part of this country. As a result of many weeks and months of study, they have reduced to a comprehensive scheme this plan. I feel that this scheme is well worthy of preservation and wider circulation, and with the consent of the House I shall insert it as a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner stated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. The matter referred to is as follows:

NAMES OF SPONSORS OF THE MOVEMENT OUTLINED.

Gordon Strong, Arthur Heurtley, Ralph C. Otis, Tracy Alden, Robert H. McCormick, Jr., Emil C. Wetten, Henry Russell Platt, Benjamin Carpenter, William B. Mann, Buckingham Chandler, Henry W. Austin, E. Allen Frost, C. L. Daniels, Edmund A. Russell, Andrew R. Sheriff, John J. Arnold, Harve G. Badgerow, Maclay Hoyne, Philletus W. Gates, Arnold Joerns, Matthew Mills, William G. Edens, Earl W. Newton, Perry M. Shepard, C. J. Eldridge, Edward Hagen, Guy Guernsey.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL OF THE MEMORANDUM.

BUSINESS MEN'S COMMITTEE FOR A NEW NATIONAL GUARD REGIMENT, CHICAGO.

DEAR SIR: A few of us, the signers of this letter, have recently come together as a sort of informal committee to promote the organization of a regiment by business men along the general lines indicated in the memorandum inclosed herewith.

We believe that you are in sympathy with the general policy of military "preparedness," and we assume that you feel a desire to be of some real and personal service in this cause, just as we ourselves desire. We suppose that you may have some doubt as to the form in which you can, as a practical matter, give such real and personal service, just as we ourselves have been doubtful.

We suggest, therefore, that you look over the inclosed memorandum, which is offered as a solution of the problem, a practical scheme offering a place for each man who feels as you and we do. Your exact place in the scheme may perhaps require thought, and will have to be determined later in connection with the others who take part in it. But that some place in such a general scheme would fit you we think you will be disposed to agree.

The scheme probably is applicable to every existing National Guard organization, but we do not propose to attach it to any such organization, at least as a first step. We propose, on the contrary, to institute the first of the many new National Guard organizations required under the new Army law—to be more specific, a regiment of Infantry to form part of the Illinois National Guard and of the new Federal system.

Details will, of course, have to evolve later. At present we are desirous of finding out who of our good and well-known citizens are disposed to take some part in the new regiment, the exact part to be one of the later details.

With the active support of such men as yourself the plan has no element of doubt. Without such support, it has little element of feasibility; the country would not yet be prepared for "preparedness."

Committee members: Gordon Strong, Arthur Heurtley, Ralph C. Otis, Tracy Alden, Robert H. McCormick, Jr., Philletus W. Gates, Andrew R. Sheriff, John J. Arnold, Albert A. Sprague, 2d, Harve G. Badgerow, Robert J. Thorne, and Maclay Hoyne.

Yours, very sincerely,

T. W. WINSTON,
For the Committee.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A REGIMENT BY BUSINESS MEN.

I. Modern armies, under every form of government, from the democratic to the despotic, consist principally of "citizen-soldiers." The present European armies are 80 per cent citizen-soldiers—men who in July, 1914, were engaged in peaceful pursuits and will return to these pursuits with the return of peace.

No nation can support through times of peace a professional army large enough for a time of war.

II. A democracy has a second reason for the organization of its citizens as soldiers—we have expressed in our National Constitution our belief that:

"A well-regulated militia is necessary to the security of a free State."

III. In more modern phraseology, no real American will permit anybody else to do his voting or his fighting for him.

Military service is not to be delegated—it is personal to you and to me.

IV. But if any man is to fight effectively in the future, he must prepare thoroughly now. And telling others to prepare is not preparedness.

Preparedness is preparing yourself and myself.

V. Preparedness can not be left to Congress and to legislation. There has always been enough legislation to permit and to help you and me to prepare, if we had wanted to. Recently Congress has passed enough legislation to make the United States a formidable military power, if you and I take advantage of it. But if you and I continue to leave it to the other fellow, we will continue to find that there are not enough fellows to perform our service for us.

Congress has done its bit; how about you and me?

VI. Preparedness is not limited to learning how; it is not satisfied with a month at a training camp in the duties of a private and in the expectation of a commission as an officer. It would take the Government a month or two to find you a place as an officer, and it would take you three to six months to train the privates assigned to you, if you found you had the executive capacity to do it.

Preparedness on your part and my part means that, if called out this morning, we leave with our regiment this afternoon.

VII. There is a world of meaning in the brief phrase above—"our regiment." A "regiment" means an organization complete at the moment in all the parts that modern military science prescribes for war purposes. It means a factory built, equipped, its machines oiled ready for the wheels to turn. It means, indeed, that the wheels have turned, and turned repeatedly, and are ready instantly to turn again. And "our" regiment means that you and I have definite places in it, to which we step at once and without uncertainty, still more, without confusion. It means that we know it from top to bottom, just as the regiment knows us. It means that we think it is the finest regiment in captivity and all we want is a chance to break loose and to demonstrate our belief.

VIII. The preparedness that stops at a training camp may, by similar analogy, be compared with the instruction of citizens here and there as foremen in factory work. If called upon to act, and if they finally decide they will act, they will still be helpless until some one has organized them, and again helpless until they have organized and instructed the operatives under them—to say nothing of the helplessness of all concerned until supplied with the necessary machinery. If the training camp satisfies the popular demand for preparedness it is the most unfortunate of military makeshifts to date.

IX. On the other hand, if the time has come in which those American men who have distinguished themselves in business recognize the real significance of, and experience a real desire for, military preparedness—complete preparedness, organized preparedness—then such organizations of American citizen-soldiers will set new standards in military efficiency as certainly as the same men have set standards of commercial enterprise and success.

For the event that this time has come, the following suggestions are offered as to the—

(a) Needs of a citizen-soldiers organization.

(b) Methods of supplying such needs by business men.

X. The first necessity of the citizen-soldier, whether officer or private, is his necessity of earning a living. The very fact that he is a citizen-soldier and not a professional soldier spells this necessity. The citizen-soldier can give to his military duties only what time is left over from his civilian duties. His military duties should therefore be limited strictly to those increasing his military proficiency. He should, in his capacity as a citizen-soldier, have no duties whatsoever of a quasi military or nonmilitary nature which can be performed by any one else equally well or better. The professional soldier may perhaps be given some quasi military or nonmilitary duties without detriment to his military proficiency—he has all day and every day to give to the job. An hour of such work given to a citizen-soldier detracts one hour from his soldierly development.

XI. On the other hand, there are many and absolutely necessary quasi military or altogether nonmilitary duties which have to be performed in connection with a citizen-soldier organization by some one. Some one must rent and equip a building as an armory to start with. Some one must subsequently conduct a campaign for a legislative appropriation to build one. Someone must oversee the numberless details in the preparation of plans and the construction of such a building.

Some one must attend to the administration of the armory—its lighting, heating, janitor service, repair, and many other such items. Some one must, on spare nights, rent the armory out for the sake of the rental thereby acquired for the regimental fund.

Some one must obtain financial contributions over and above the legislative appropriation and the rentals in question. Congress appropriates nothing and the State legislature will never appropriate enough for the maintenance of either a company or a regiment with adequate facilities for developing their military proficiency. This deficit can only be made up by the contributions of individuals. Some one must solicit these contributions.

Some one must obtain recruits for each company so long as the voluntary system continues and unless and until we adopt the universal compulsion of the Old World; some one must persuade citizen soldiers that it is a part of good citizenship to do their part of soldiering; some one must advertise that this is the time and the place and the regiment; some one must keep the ranks filled or there is no regiment.

Some one in the past has had to organize social features by company, battalion, and regiment; athletic events, and every other interest and inducement to obtain desirable recruits.

It is barely possible that in the future the pay provisions of the new Army law will so assist recruiting that these additional inducements will not be strictly necessary. On the other hand, to get the best possible class of recruits it will probably continue desirable to offer the greatest practicable inducements.

Some one must, even after recruits are once enlisted, see to it that they attend drill on the one hand and that they do not lose their jobs on the other hand. The penalties for desertion will not provide drill attendance, or, if exercised for this purpose, they will put an end to recruiting. The citizen soldier can not practically be compelled to attend drill. He must be helped and persuaded to attend drill. That this can be done under a voluntary system the records of many organizations give convincing testimony.

XII. All of the above functions, which are necessary functions for the maintenance of a citizen-soldier organization, are more or less nonmilitary. Most of them are absolutely nonmilitary and have no more connection with real soldiering than the raising of cattle for Army consumption or the weaving of cloth for military uniforms. The best proof of the nonmilitary character of these functions is that the professional soldier is not called upon to perform any of them while in the exercise of his real military duties. He may be given a job at some post as quartermaster or in some city as recruiting officer; but the field service knows no such functions. Even in peace service at posts, line officers are no more concerned in their housing,

financing, or their recruiting than they are with agriculture or textile manufacture.

In the United States in the past, however, citizen-soldier organizations have had these functions to perform as a necessity to their existence. These functions have, therefore, been given the first thought and time of the officers of such organizations, primarily of the captains in one-company stations in small towns and of the colonels in regimental stations in cities. It has been the obvious and unavoidable result that officers could not develop on their own part or that of their organizations the degree of military proficiency which they have desired or which they could have developed if their time and efforts had been devoted exclusively to military study and work.

XIII. To solve this very fundamental problem the solution is proposed that with each regiment and its three "combatant" battalions there be established a "home battalion," the function of the home battalion to be the performance of all of the nonmilitary or quasi-military duties that can be by it performed, leaving to the combatant battalions and their officers nothing but the technical instruction and practice of themselves and their men as soldiers.

A tentative detailed scheme of organization of such a "home battalion" is outlined in Appendix A. Only the general principles underlying the scheme are here suggested.

XIV. The functions to be performed have been indicated in paragraph 11 above. The method of performing them and its applicability to you as a business man remain to be considered.

Let us assume that you are a young married man with a family, fighting your way in the business world, and with serious results threatening you and yours if you let up in your fight. You should not be called upon to fight in the military world except as a very last resource. You should not be solicited to enlist—you should not even be permitted to enlist—in a citizen-soldier organization. You do not belong in the first line or in the second line or perhaps even in the third line.

But patriotism and preparedness may have come home to you, and you may want to serve your country and serve it now. You can do it by joining the home battalion and by giving the same amount of time to the work of the regiment in its administrative activities that your fellow citizens without such home ties are giving in the combatant battalions to learning to fight. The work is there, and it is just as necessary upon some one's part as learning to fight; all that remains is for you to be that some one.

The duties are not nominal and honoray; they involve constant responsibility, real and practical work. If they are performed successfully, the regiment will profit as much, and you can congratulate yourself as much as if you had taken part in a successful maneuver in the field. And with the proper and close affiliation between the combatant and the home battalions these facts will be duly recognized.

XV. Perhaps in your business career you have passed beyond the stage outlined above. You have a wife and family, but they are no longer strictly dependent upon you, because your business success has made them independent. But your business itself may be in a large measure dependent upon you. It may be dependent upon you to such an extent that any considerable time taken from it means a loss to the interests you represent which you have no right to inflict.

Yet, as in the case of our younger friend above, patriotism and preparedness may have come home to you also, and you, too, may want to serve your country and serve it now. You can do it by joining the home battalion and by giving a sum of money according to your desire and your capacity, coupled with your moral support, to be expressed by quarterly or other periodic attendance at regimental formations in the armory and in the field, and by personal acquaintance with and encouragement of your fellow members of the home battalion and the members of the combatant battalions.

The foregoing form of service is to be distinguished from the writing of a check to satisfy an importunate solicitor and forgetting about it for the 12 months ensuing. Unless your good will, expressed by your attendance as above, goes with your check the contribution should be returned and the membership in the home battalion canceled.

The service of the flag is personal service; it is not almsgiving, and it is not the hiring of a mercenary force.

As to the amount of money that you turn into the regimental fund along with your good will you may find it helpful to use the new Army law to determine. The law estimates the value per annum of the time given by a private at \$50. There is no lower grade in which a man may serve than as a private. If your ambition mounts to higher flights, you may give the equivalent of the services of a captain, which the Army law fixes at \$500. Lest the regiment be considered the creature of "predatory wealth," this is perhaps the largest single contribution that should be received. There are intervening ranks and values, some one of which may meet your estimate of your duty in the premises.

All of the sums so contributed should go into the regimental fund and be administered and dispensed by the officers of the home battalion for the sole purpose of maintaining and increasing the efficiency of the combatant battalions and the regiment as a fighting machine.

XVI. It seems reasonable that a regiment built upon the lines of strict military proficiency and devotion to military work on the part of its combatant battalions and upon the basis of active support with the best thought and time and money of its home battalion can and will develop a new standard in citizen soldiery and solve the problem of preparedness without militarism of democracy with adequate defense.

The success of this solution depends on you and on me. I am ready to begin now. How about you?

TYPEWRITTEN APPENDIX TO MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A REGIMENT BY BUSINESS MEN.

HOME BATTALION.

President, first vice president (ex officio chairman of house committee), second vice president (ex officio chairman of recruiting committee), third vice president (ex officio chairman of finance committee), fourth vice president (ex officio chairman of political-action committee), fifth vice president (ex officio chairman of athletic committee), sixth vice president (ex officio chairman of entertainment committee), secretary, assistant secretary, treasurer, legal counsel, publicity manager, librarian, and band director.

Executive committee: House committee, recruiting committee, political-action committee, athletic committee, entertainment.

Company A: Captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, sergeants, corporals, privates.

Company B: Captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, sergeants, corporals, privates.

Company C: Captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, sergeants, corporals, privates.

Company D: Captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, sergeants, corporals, privates.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE MEN.

The duty of officers and committee men, in general, would be the devotion of the necessary time to the performance of the functions referred to in Paragraph XI and according to the method outlined in Paragraphs XIV and XV of the foregoing memorandum. In general the scheme of organization and the apportionment of work should be such that the time required of each officer and committee man of the home battalion will be approximately that required of any officer or private of the combatant battalions. This last amounts to at least one evening per week and two weeks per annum. All officers of the home battalion should probably report at the armory for conference and business one evening per week. Committee meetings can be arranged either on such evening or in the daytime, as most convenient. Much of the individual work of officers and of committee men will probably be most conveniently done through their respective business offices and during business hours.

It is not intended that the positions of officers and committee men of the home battalion should be nominal but practical working positions. Only those prepared to give the necessary time and work should consider taking such.

On the other hand, there will be unquestionably a great deal of detail work which could, as a business proposition, be most cheaply and effectively handled by some one personally giving the greater part or all of his time to such work, and he should therefore be compensated from the regimental fund. This person may perhaps be designated as an "assistant secretary," and such position is included in the scheme of organization proposed. All other officers and committee men of the home battalion should give the fractional time required of them without compensation as their contribution to the regiment and to national defense.

PRESIDENT.

The duties of the president would be those of the president of any other organization for cooperative public service. On the other hand, it should not be permitted, as in case of many organizations for public service, that the president perform the duties of most other officers and committee men, through default on their part. The home-battalion scheme rests on personal service, which can not be rendered and evaded at the same time.

VICE PRESIDENTS.

It is suggested, as a possible feature of organization, that the number of vice presidents correspond with the number of standing committees, one vice president to be ex officio the chairman of each committee, all such vice presidents to be also ex officio members of the executive committee and to represent in the weekly meetings of the executive committee the work of their respective standing committee.

SECRETARY.

The duties of the Secretary would be those ordinarily pertaining to the position and title, and should include the custody of all of the records of the home battalion at the armory, these records comprising everything connected with the civil administration of the regiment, and with the work of the various committees, etc. The secretary could probably perform but supervision only in the limited time available by him, and the very considerable detail work should be performed by an assistant secretary, as suggested above and in the following:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

The duties of the assistant secretary would, in general, be those suggested above, in connection with the secretary, and would unquestionably be numerous and time consuming enough, if properly handled, to demand most, if not all, of the time of a capable man, which time should therefore be compensated from the regimental fund, as suggested above in connection with officers and committee men in general.

TREASURER.

The duties of the treasurer would be those ordinarily pertaining to the position and title. These duties should also include the handling of all State and Federal allotments from appropriations for the regiment either for armory rent or other purposes, their correct vouchering, and the like. Although this is a quasi-military matter, it is one that can perfectly well be performed by a capable civilian, and one of which the combatant officers should be relieved. The treasurer can and should be assisted in the details of his work by the assistant secretary.

LEGAL COUNSEL.

There should be at least one, and perhaps for cases of absence from town two, competent attorneys to attend not only to such matters as are of a purely civil nature, such as the execution of contracts and the like, but also to relieve the combatant officers of quasimilitary functions, such as the determination of questions of military law, prosecution when thought advisable of military offenses, advice and assistance in matters of court-martial, boards of survey, and the like. It would not be feasible for combatant officers to take all such matters up either with the judge advocate general of the State or with a judge advocate of the United States.

PUBLICITY MANAGER.

There should be at least one and probably two or three competent advertising and newspaper men whose duty it will be to see that the regiment has its proper place in public opinion. No one will join either the combatant battalions or the home battalion without knowing about the regiment and without believing that it is the best regiment to join. The publicity should suggest ways and means for developing the necessary publicity, giving so much of their time toward effecting the ways and means as is necessary, but in many cases acting through the officers and through the several committees.

LIBRARIAN.

The regiment should have an absolutely first-class regimental military library in a proper sort of reading room, offering every facility for military study to officers and privates of the combatant battalions. The duties of the librarian should be to see that such is the case. In the details of such duty, particularly in the cataloguing, the issue and receipts of books, etc., he should be represented by the assistant secretary.

BAND DIRECTOR.

Every regiment is required by law to have a band. A model regiment should have a model band, and it should be the duty of the band director to see that it has such; moreover, the band should not make

its first and last appearance at the annual encampments. It ought to be on hand for at least monthly formations of the regiments and band concerts, perhaps with dancing afterwards. Band music is one of the best emotional stimulants to patriotic and military ardor. This fact is perfectly well known to present organizations, and the only reason that they do not have such service on the part of their respective bands is because the regimental funds do not permit. In the case of the regiment proposed, the fund should be large enough to permit of all the band service that is desirable.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The executive committee should comprise practically all of the officers above enumerated, and should be charged with the general civil administration of the regiment already outlined. It should probably meet weekly at the armory, such meeting to be on the meeting night of the officers of the combatant battalions. This simultaneous meeting of the combatant and of the noncombatant officers will promote the necessary close affiliation between the two groups.

HOUSE COMMITTEE.

This committee should comprise at least one prominent architect, one contractor, and one merchant. The committee should be charged with the equipment, current maintenance, and repair of the armory in every particular.

RECRUITING COMMITTEE.

This committee should comprise several employers in different lines of employment who are in wide touch with the conditions of civil employment. The duty of this committee would be to devise the necessary recruiting campaigns to fill and to keep filled the ranks of the combatant battalions. They should also consider and pass upon questions arising between soldiers and their employers, matters of drill attendance, and the like.

FINANCE COMMITTEE.

This committee should probably comprise one or more bankers and certainly one or more members versed in public-service organization work. The duty of this committee would be to fill the ranks of the proposed four companies of the home battalion, such companies in turn to consist of the subscribers to the regimental fund.

POLITICAL-ACTION COMMITTEE.

This committee should comprise men of political acquaintance and influence. The duty of this committee would be to see that the regiment has all of the legislative consideration properly due it. In co-operation with similar representatives of other similar organizations they can make the proper showing before State and Federal legislative committees as to the needs of our citizen soldiery as a whole. Appropriations being once made, however, it is to be remembered that their distribution will take place purely through military channels which it should not be attempted in any way to influence or divert.

ATHLETIC COMMITTEE.

The duty of this committee would be to develop athletics, both individual and between organizations, in the regiment, and between the regiment and other regimental organizations, for the double purpose of improving the physique of the soldier and of increasing his interest in the regiment.

ENTERTAINMENT COMMITTEE.

The duty of this committee would be to devise periodic entertainments, particularly for the men of the combatant battalions, such entertainments to constitute an additional inducement over and above that of military service and of Federal pay, to join and to remain in the regiment. Perhaps, without such extra inducement, the ranks could be filled. But with all possible inducements the ranks could be filled with the best possible recruits.

THE COMPANIES.

The home battalion would comprise, in addition to the foregoing officers and committee men, four companies to consist of the subscribers to the regimental fund. The members of these companies would be graded according to the amount of their subscription based upon the pay provisions in the new Army law.

Over and above the making of such contribution, which might be in the form of either annual, semiannual, quarterly, or monthly payments, the duty of each member of each of the four companies would be to attend at least quarterly a regimental formation, one of these formations to be at the annual encampment. By this attendance the members of the four companies will give tangible evidence that their good will goes with their contributions; and they will acquire personal acquaintance not only with the officers and committee men of their own home battalion but also with the officers and, as far as possible, with the men of the combatant battalions.

Finally, each member of each of the four companies will be expected on all occasions to give his good word and his good deed for the benefit of the regiment. So far as he can without the giving of material time and effort, he will be expected to promote the work of the recruiting committee in particular by indorsement, introductions, and the like; and of the other officers and committee men of the home battalion in general.

It will be important and perhaps vital that ways and means be devised for keeping the contributing members of the four companies, who will have no actual and considerable work to do, in close and sympathetic touch with the working personnel of the home battalion and the combatant battalions.

LETTER FOLLOWING THE TRANSMITTAL OF THE MEMORANDUM.

BUSINESS MEN'S COMMITTEE FOR A NEW NATIONAL GUARD REGIMENT, CHICAGO.

DEAR SIR: A short while ago you received from one of us a memorandum concerning the formation of a regiment by business men. Since then a few more of us have joined the colors and undertaken to act as a preliminary organization committee.

The issuing of the memorandum has naturally elicited a variety of replies, disclosing the indeterminate state of mind of the public on this important matter. There appears, we regret to say, some disposition to feel that the subject is important enough to discuss but not to act upon, and even then not to act unless the solution of the question is entirely satisfactory to each individual concerned.

One point of view is that the militaristic chaos in Europe may result in disarmament, arbitration, and other very desirable but apparently uncertain after effects, and that any increase of our military strength at this juncture would be most inopportune.

Another point of view is that we should adopt universal compulsory service, and in the meantime, to be consistent at whatever hazard, we

should refrain from voluntary service of any sort. It seems to us, however, that if there is a moderate need for even considering and discussing universal compulsory service, there is very grave and urgent need for some immediate voluntary service until such compulsion comes.

To the advocate of universal service we offer the opinion of Col. Ronayne, a copy of which is transmitted herewith, to the effect that more National Guard regiments are directly in line with any kind of service that is of assured military value.

We further offer the suggestion that every new unit organized, whether voluntary or by compulsion, is another unit; does bring the service that much nearer to being universal; and shows that we believe enough in the service which we preach to put it into personal practice.

Finally, each new unit means a new military school, teaching patriotism and military service as the expression of patriotism, and sending out its students and its graduates to spread this teaching to educate the public.

We very much wish to form a larger committee of organization to work out another step in the direction indicated in the memorandum. One possible form of action and organization is that indicated in the inclosed appendix, but it is entirely tentative as yet.

May we count upon you to be one of us?

Yours, very sincerely,

GORDON STRONG,
ARTHUR HEURTLEY,
RALPH C. OTIS,
TRACY ALDEN,
ROBERT H. MCCORMICK, JR.,
PHILETUS W. GATES,

ANDREW R. SHERIFF;
JOHN J. ARNOLD,
ALBERT A. SPRAGUE, II,
HARVE G. BADGEROW,
ROBERT J. THORNE,
MACLAY HOYNE,
Committee Members.

LETTER FROM COL. RONAYNE, ILLINOIS NATIONAL GUARD, COMMENTING ON THE PLAN CONTAINED IN THE MEMORANDUM.

CHICAGO, September 25, 1916.

MY DEAR COL. STRONG: In reply to the request of yourself and others for an expression of my opinion as to the relation of a new National Guard regiment, raised under the new Army legislation, to possible universal compulsory service, I have to state as follows:

The opinion that I express must, of course, be understood to be my personal opinion only, and not that of an officer either of the United States Army or of the Illinois National Guard, though, of course, the data upon which my opinion is based have naturally come to me from experience in both of these capacities.

If the United States adopts some form of universal compulsory service, it would do so, more or less, in one of two forms:

(a) A system of training only, by which young men receive instruction supposed to qualify them either as enlisted men or as officers, but without their formation into definite and permanent units. If this system were adopted, it would merely create the impression that the country is prepared, and perhaps would therefore be worse than the present situation, in which the country knows that it is not prepared.

(b) In conjunction with such training as above, the organization of definite and permanent units, whether under Federal or State control, or both, and resembling the National Guard regiments at present. Nothing short of this will ever give a satisfactory service, capable of immediate mobilization, and reliable when mobilized.

There has been of late, as you know, much discussion of the Australian and Swiss systems—usually without real acquaintance with their military value. As to the Australian system, this is clearly the fact, since it has been established so recently that the Australians themselves do not know its military value. So far it is in an undergraduate stage, so to speak, and what its graduates will do when they are ready for service is, of course, an open question. The splendid record made by the Australian troops in the present war has no bearing on the new Australian system; these troops were raised like those in England and like those in our Civil War—by volunteering of untrained men after the war began.

As to the Swiss system, while it has existed much longer, it has not been put to the test of war. And I think it a fair statement to say that a large proportion of military students, including experienced Swiss officers, believe the system to be seriously deficient in many ways.

The War College Division of our General Staff Corps expresses the following opinion as to the merits of the Australian and Swiss systems: "It must be admitted that the systems of these two States are of doubtful utility to a world power facing the question of adequate preparedness in all its phases."

For the benefit of your business friends, I may suggest that warfare, like those more peaceful activities which we call business, may be looked upon from much the same point of view. A system by which the country receives military training without the organization and the long working out of permanent military units, stands in about the same position as would the vocational education of a lot of young men without organizing them into some factory or store, weeding out the unfit, promoting the fit, and finally establishing a successful business organization.

Business men must surely appreciate this, knowing what is meant by "a going concern." No masses of vocational school or business college graduates, even if organized on paper, or even if attending an annual Chautauqua, would for a moment be considered a real business organization.

Neither would a group of similarly trained individuals constitute a military organization. The nearest approach we have to real military organization, outside of the Regular Army, are those which now form the National Guard. Their efficiency has been variable, and in all cases has been the less for lack of adequate legislative and popular support. While some universal compulsory law might go far to supply this lack of support, it will not, in my judgment, render organization of this type unnecessary. Such organizations must and will continue, perhaps under a range of name, and it is certainly to be hoped with a change of popular appreciation and respect.

To summarize, I suggest that the formation of a new regiment such as proposed by you and your friends would be a step in the direction of universal compulsory service, if such service ever comes; and in the meantime a much-needed substitute.

Yours, very truly,

JAMES RONAYNE.

[Extract from Chicago Commerce (organ of the Chicago Association of Commerce) of Dec. 29, 1915.]

DEFENSE AND BUSINESS MAN—BUILDING NEW NATIONAL GUARD REGIMENTS SUPPORTED BY HOME BATTALIONS.

There is now circulating among well-known business men, and signed by names such as are found below, a communication having for its place

of origin the so-called "Business Men's Committee for a New National Guard Regiment." The offices of the committee are in the Republic Building, and the agent of the committee is Lieut. Col. T. W. Winston, United States Army, retired.

The communication in question contains a proposal for the institution of the "first of many new National Guard organizations required under the new Army law; to be more specific, a regiment of Infantry to form part of the Illinois National Guard and of the new Federal system."

Accompanying this communication is a memorandum concerning the establishment of a regiment by business men. This memorandum is direct and pungent stuff designed to promote preparedness through personal service of the citizen-soldier. The memorandum offers suggestions as to the needs of the citizen-soldier organization, and as to the methods of supplying such needs by business men.

This memorandum contains no ineffectual rally-round-the-flag talk, but it aims to impress upon interested men what a regiment would mean which they might be concerned in organizing. It is pointed out that the citizen-soldier's military duties should be limited strictly to those increasing his military proficiency, and as a citizen-soldier he should have no duties which can not be performed by anyone else quite as well or better; on the other hand, there are many necessary quasi-military or wholly nonmilitary duties which have to be performed in connection with a citizen-soldier organization by some one, and this some one, as detailed in this memorandum, has his hands mighty full in various activities.

To account for these activities it is proposed that with each regiment there be established a "home battalion," its function being to perform all nonmilitary or quasi-military duties, leaving to the combatant battalion and their officers nothing but technical instruction and practice of themselves and their men as soldiers.

Many of the men signing the aforesaid circular, and many to whom it has probably been sent, are for various reasons qualified best to join the so-called home battalion, "giving the same amount of time to the work of the regiment in its administrative activities that your fellow citizens without such home ties are giving in the combatant battalions to learning to fight." The duties involve "constant responsibility, real and practical work; the service to the flag is a personal service. It is not almsgiving and it is not hiring of a mercenary force. All sums contributed should go into the regimental fund and should be administered and dispensed by the officers of the home battalion for the sole purpose of maintaining and increasing the efficiency of combatant battalions and the regiment as a fighting machine."

Among the citizens identified with the issuance of the foregoing call to service with the colors in ways both new and old, or pledging subsequent participation, are Albert A. Sprague II, Robert J. Thorne, Robert H. McCormick, Jr., Ralph Otis, Arthur Huertley, John J. Arnold, Maclay Hoyne, Arnold Joerns, W. G. Edens, Joseph H. Defrees, Benjamin Carpenter, Henry W. Austin, E. Allen Frost, Philletus W. Gates, Guy Guernsey, Mathew Mills, and others of like standing.

SELECTION OF JURORS IN UNITED STATES COURTS.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 20209) to amend section 276 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 276 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 276. All such jurors, grand and petit, including those summoned during the session of the court, shall be publicly drawn from a box containing, at the time of each drawing, the names of not less than 300 persons, possessing the qualifications prescribed in the section last preceding, which names shall have been placed therein by the clerk of such court, or a duly qualified deputy clerk, and a commissioner, to be appointed by the judge thereof, or by the judge senior in commission in districts having more than one judge, which commissioner shall be a citizen of good standing, residing in the district in which such court is held, and a well-known member of the principal political party in the district in which the court is held opposing that to which the clerk, or a duly qualified deputy clerk then acting, may belong, the clerk, or a duly qualified deputy clerk, and said commissioner each to place one name in said box alternately, without reference to party affiliations until the whole number required shall be placed therein."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I read this bill Saturday night and compared it with the existing law, and my recollection is that the only change made from the existing statute is to insert a provision respecting the power of the deputy clerk.

Mr. WEBB. The words are "of a duly qualified deputy clerk." The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MANN. So that instead of the clerk under this decision of the court being required to travel to the various places where court is held, his deputy may aid.

Mr. WEBB. That is very true. There is no money with which to pay a clerk to travel 400 miles to assist in drawing a jury, and along the Mexican border and in other places, unless this provision is made, there will be no court held.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein an article by Mr. Charlton G. Ogburn, of the Savannah (Ga.) bar, en-

titled "The Lawyer and Democracy," appearing in the American Law Review for September-October, 1915.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner stated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of salary increase for Federal employees.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of increasing the salaries of Federal employees. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address by Gen. Black, Chief of Engineers, on some problems connected with inland waterways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein a speech by our former colleague, Capt. Hobson, delivered at Columbus, Ohio, last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have some information about what this is.

Mr. FESS. The address is entitled "Destroying the destroyer."

Mr. SLAYDEN. It is one of the assaults on the demon rum?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. By schooners or battleships?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my friend from Ohio if this address has not been published in the RECORD already.

Mr. FESS. Not this speech.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask whether the gentleman from Ohio knows the purpose of inserting this in the RECORD? Is it for Capt. Hobson to have it distributed all over the United States at Government expense? When Mr. Hobson was a Member of Congress he sent out millions of copies under his frank, and after he ceased to be a Member of Congress he sent out millions of copies under his frank at the expense of the public. It was the grossest prostitution of the franking privilege that has ever been exhibited in this country. An honest man would not have done it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to another outrage that occurred only a few days ago, where Collier's Weekly advertised that it would send any person, on application, a copy of a speech delivered some time ago; that that was sent under the frank of a Member when, if the speech had to pay postage, it would have cost about 4 cents. It seems to me that if speeches are sent out they ought to be sent by the Member himself.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. I paid \$103 for printing that speech—every dollar out of my own pocket. They have no franked envelopes, and they must pay the postage.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, I will simply say that a young man sent to Collier's for a copy of the speech and it came back in a big manila envelope with the frank of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FREAR. It was without my knowledge.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to frankly state, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that I do not know whether the purpose of Capt. Hobson is to circulate this speech or not. I did not get the speech from Capt. Hobson. I got it and read it yesterday, and I want to state to the House that it is a scholarly speech, and, I think, very worthy of being read. I would not want to take any advantage of the House Members or anyone else. I really think it ought to go into the RECORD.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have three or four minutes to express my views about this.

Mr. STAFFORD. Still reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the gentleman from Texas having his time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Texas addressing the House for four minutes? Of course the gentleman from Ohio will lose none of his rights.

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days we have had very elaborate and illuminating discussions about the abuse of the mailing privilege, incidentally the franking privilege. It was very clearly established, convincingly established, to me,

at least, that the people, the taxpayers, were contributing many millions of dollars to certain publishers. The products of the printing press belonging to these gentlemen are transported practically free of cost to the ultimate buyer of their publications.

Now, these same papers that enjoy that privilege and have that much advantage—I think I might go so far as to employ the word used by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] and say that have so much graft out of the Public Treasury—have been howling against what they call "pork." Why, Mr. Speaker, if the recent public-building bill was all pork, this publishers' benefit is an annual packing house. [Laughter and applause.]

They can not say, or at least they refuse to concede, what is evident to all other people, that they are getting the benefit of a tax levied upon people who are not their customers. I believe that the cost of the transportation of the products of the printing press should be paid by the people who benefit by these publications, and I can see no more reason for transporting magazines at the expense of the General Treasury than I can for the transportation at nominal cost of the wheat and corn and meat that grow in my district to the ultimate consumer, for certainly bread is of more value to more people than magazines. Man can not live by magazines alone.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio said he wanted to answer frankly, but he knows that the purpose of printing this speech of Capt. Hobson is to get it circulated without the payment of postage.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. If it goes into the Record under my name, it would have to be circulated under my frank, would it not?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, no; I think not.

Mr. FESS. I was about to say that it would not be circulated under my frank.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, in order that we may get along with other and more pressing business, in view of the deficit, and in view of the fact that we are already making contributions of several million dollars a year to publishers and can not afford to tax the American people for the benefit of a particular propaganda, I will object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

CHARLESTON HARBOR.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing an article by the president of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce on the development of Charleston Harbor and Navy Yard.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. FESS. I do not object.

There was no objection.

RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering District bills, this being District day.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a preferential motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 20079) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider District bills, and the gentleman from Florida makes a preferential motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the river and harbor bill. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky) there were 62 ayes and 33 noes.

So the motion of Mr. SPARKMAN was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. RAINEY as permanent Chairman.

Mr. RUBEY took the chair temporarily in the absence of Mr. RAINEY.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20079) making appropriation for the construction, repair, and the preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUBEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20079, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the rivers and harbors bill, and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three hours, one half of that time to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I think I will have to have a little more time than that on this side. I have requests for two hours, and I do not see how I can limit it to much less than that, because the longest request that has been made is for 30 minutes, and that is by a member of the committee. I can not see how I can well limit it to less time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to four hours, one half of that time to be controlled by myself and the other by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That will be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill shall not exceed four hours, one half of the time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the rivers and harbors bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of bill H. R. 20079, the rivers and harbors bill, with Mr. RUBEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20079) making appropriation for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

[Mr. SPARKMAN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee for a short time to a matter that has been before Congress for several years, but which has been lying dormant for quite a while. That is the proposal to enact a workmen's compensation law covering the employees of the interstate carriers of the Nation.

President Wilson, in making an address of welcome to the delegates of the social insurance conference held in the city of Washington last month, was quoted as stating that the Nation has turned from political to social questions. To my mind no greater social question has confronted the American people during recent years than the subject of workmen's compensation for our interstate-railway employees.

Since the agitation for legislation in the Sixty-first Congress 32 States have enacted workmen's compensation laws, none of which, so far as I have been able to learn, affects or actually benefits the employees of the interstate railroads of our country. The Democratic Party, inspired by the great sentiment which prevailed in the Sixty-second Congress for the enactment of a workmen's compensation law national in its character, inserted in their 1912 platform the following plank:

We pledge the Democratic Party, so far as the Federal jurisdiction extends, to an employees' compensation law providing adequate indemnity for injury to body or loss of life.

Since that time one Democratic Congress has come and gone and another is fast approaching the closing days of its existence. Up to this time no bill has been reported having for its purpose the carrying out of this sacred promise made by the Democracy

to labor. Bills were introduced in the Sixty-third Congress and in the first session of this Congress, and the committees to which they were referred have had access to an exhaustive, clear, and comprehensive report on the law and the facts pertaining to the subject of workmen's compensation, consisting of 200 pages, known as Senate Document 338, second session Sixty-second Congress, together with a printed 1,500-page compilation of the hearings upon which this report was based, the result of the labors of a commission created under an act of the Sixty-first Congress, which, by the way, was a Republican Congress, a commission appointed by President Taft, the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWITZER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman knows, I suspect, that both the Senate and the House passed a Federal workmen's compensation act last September.

Mr. SWITZER. That was a law for the benefit of Government employees only. My remarks are directed to a law national in its character, covering the employees of interstate railways, which measure received the indorsement of your party in 1912, in their national convention, as much as the proposition that you refer to.

The personnel of this commission to which I have just referred consisted of Senators SUTHERLAND and CHAMBERLAIN, Representatives William G. Brantley and Reuben O. Moon, Mr. W. C. Brown, president of the New York Central Railway, a representative of the railways of the country, and Mr. W. L. Cease, editor of the Railway Trainman, a representative of labor.

Since the advent of the Wilson administration Democratic ardor for this particular right of labor seems to have become very much chilled; for while it was a conspicuous plank in the 1912 platform, their more recent expression of platform promises in 1916 is just as conspicuous, because of an entire absence of any specific reference whatever to the subject, amounting to a repudiation of their former stand for the most important social proposition that has faced Congress for several years. And while it may be true, as the President states, that the people are rapidly turning to social questions, it would appear equally apparent that the Democratic Party has not only turned from but has actually run away from an important social problem which four years ago they believed was very much in need of congressional attention, and which they at that time pledged their party to solve speedily by enacting a law providing adequate indemnity for injury to body or loss of life.

The report of the Taft Joint Commission, to which I have just referred, declared that the existing employers' liability based upon negligence and its corresponding defenses no longer meets the requirements of modern industrial conditions, that the system had become outgrown and should be abandoned, and there should be established instead of a system based on the fault of the employer one bottomed upon the fact that injury by accident had occurred while in the course of employment. The commission recommended that every injured employee should receive some compensation, and in the event of the death of the employee by reason of accident that his widow or dependent should receive a reasonable compensation, regardless of the old common-law defenses of assumed risk and contributory negligence; that no act or neglect on the part of the employee or a fellow employee could defeat a recovery unless it be proved that the injury or death was occasioned by his willful intention to bring about the injury or death of himself or another, or that the injury or death was a direct result of his intoxication.

In an effort to carry out the recommendation of the commission the Senate in the Sixty-second Congress, May, 1912, by a vote of 60 to 15, passed a workmen's compensation bill covering the employees of interstate railways. This bill was amended by providing more liberal rates of compensation, and was passed in the House March 1, 1913, by a vote of 218 for to 81 against.

This amended measure went back to the Senate where, under a threat to start a filibuster against it in the closing days of the session, its passage was effectually blocked and it died at the expiration of the Sixty-second Congress.

This measure had the indorsement of all the heads of the various railway brotherhoods; of their representative agent, H. E. Wills; the head of the American Federation of Labor, Samuel Gompers; and their representative, who appeared before the commission and the Senate committee who indorsed this amended measure, is now the Senator elect of the great State of Minnesota, Hon. FRANK B. KELLOGG. Its passage on the floor of the House was championed by that well-recognized representative of labor, still a Member of the House, Hon. DAVID J. LEWIS,

of the State of Maryland. By the way, I will print at the end of my observations the remarks made by him on that occasion.

The Republican Party in its last annual platform declared for this species of workmen's compensation by a declaration in their platform favoring the enactment of "a generous and comprehensive workmen's compensation law within the commerce power of Congress."

To my mind no more important piece of legislation has ever been recommended since the administration of Abraham Lincoln than that recommended by the commission created by the Sixty-first Congress and indorsed by President Taft. During the first session of this Congress, as the gentleman, my colleague from Ohio, just referred to, a workmen's compensation bill was passed, but it covered Government employees only. Its benefits are extended to the railway mail clerks and other Government officials, many of whom have been and are being appointed for partisan reasons.

Why, then, should the Democratic Party refuse, why should the Republican Party refuse, why should this Congress refuse to enact a compensation law which will benefit upward of 2,000,000 toilers who build, maintain, and operate the interstate railroads of this country over which are transported the railway mail clerks and Government officials, especially when the compensation to be received on account of the injury or death by accident will be borne by the railway companies of the country? Is the labor of the railway employee less hazardous than the labor of the Government employee? Congress at this time is apparently earnestly engaged in an endeavor to shorten the working hours of 20 per cent of 2,000,000 toilers to whom I have just referred. Why should not Congress become as intensely interested in incorporating into the national statute a proposition designed to adequately compensate the thousands and thousands of crippled and suffering railroad employees annually injured?

Practically every foreign nation has provided some sort of compensation for those engaged in hazardous industrial employments, especially those engaged in the operation of steam and electric railway systems of their country, irrespective of the cause of the accident. Two-thirds of the States of the Union, recognizing the great importance of securing adequate redress for the thousands injured annually in industrial employments, have supplemented those old archaic systems based on the fault of the employer by enacting compensation laws based on the fact that injury and death have ensued while in the course of the performance of contractual duties.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWITZER. I will.

Mr. DENISON. Can the gentleman from Ohio state approximately the number of men employed in the service in interstate commerce injured annually?

Mr. SWITZER. I think the joint commission to which I have referred says that upward of 100,000 of railroad employees are annually injured, and as the result of such injuries four or five thousand annually die.

In that connection I desire to say that the report also shows that the railway companies of the country expend something like ten or eleven million dollars annually in payment of personal-injury and death claims. If the measure that I have referred to had become a law, the railroad companies would have been compelled to expend something like \$20,000,000 annually. The difference between the two systems would be this: Under the old common-law methods, the system based on the fault of the employer, not exceeding half to two-fifths of the number annually injured received any compensation, and not over 35 per cent of what was paid out ever entered the pockets of the injured employees, or, in the case of death, of the widow of the deceased. The remainder was expended in paying lawyers' fees and the cost of litigation. Under the measure defeated in the Sixty-second Congress \$20,000,000 would have been distributed to the 100,000 annually injured and to the widows and dependents of four or five thousand who annually meet their death as the result of such injuries. The benefits of the bill would have been shared in by all the employees of interstate railways—section men, track-repair men, trackwalkers, switchmen, terminal men, bridge men, ticket agents, telegraphers, office forces, car-repair men, shopmen, mechanics, brakemen, conductors, baggagemen, firemen, and enginemen, and all others—in the event of injury while in service and by their widows and dependents in case of death.

As I stated, practically every civilized country of Europe, and a large number of the States of the Union, have enacted compensation laws establishing the principle that these injuries are to be considered as part of the risks of the employment and that the burden of the loss, or at least the greater portion of the burden of the loss, should be borne by the industry and not by

the people disabled. It seems to me that the time has arrived when it would be well for this Congress to pass a compensation law, at least for the benefit of the employees of the interstate railways, if not for all interstate carriers of the country; and it seems to me that the progressive spirit of our civilization, especially along the lines of social justice, demands the enactment of a compensation law applicable to the interstate carriers of the country, providing adequate indemnity, certain and uniform rates of compensation throughout every State of the Union, for every injury and every death the result of accident in all lines of railway employment. The substitution of a humane, rational, and a simple system benefiting all who are injured for the complex, antiquated, and glaringly inequitable system which benefits only the few. [Applause.]

The following are the remarks of Hon. DAVID J. LEWIS, a Representative from the State of Maryland, on the floor of the House, March 1, 1913:

Mr. Speaker, in the coming year 90,000 are to be injured on our railroads and 10,000 killed. This is as much to be expected as the orderly operation of the planets themselves. Under existing law less than one-third of these victims will receive some \$15,000,000, certainly not more than \$20,000,000, with their lawyers to pay. Under the bill that is presented to the House to-night all the victims will be compensated and that sum will be lifted from \$48,000,000 to \$60,000,000 as compensation to the victims of industry. [Applause.] We are confronted by a practical question. Are two-thirds of these victims to lose some \$40,000,000 next year because lawyers would like to adapt this measure to the old legal remedial forms of procedure rather than accept it as an adequate principle in itself? It is hard on the lawyers as a class. I am a lawyer, and I want to say if I go back to the profession for my living it will be very hard on me. But it will be an act of justice to the soldiers of industry such as even this great body will seldom have an opportunity to make. [Applause.] (See p. 4502, pt. 5, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 3d sess., 62d Cong.)

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] such time as he may wish.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, Congress in the past years has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for improvement of rivers and harbors that have been absolutely wasted, and still these bills are continually brought before Congress for consideration. While there are many worthy projects included in this bill it is loaded down with unworthy ones. This bill should be considered as all other appropriation bills are considered, and the localities deserving consideration should be given consideration by the committee, and those that do not deserve consideration should be stricken out. But this will not be done, for like all so-called pork-barrel legislation the just provisions go with the unjust, and places that should have no appropriations have to get them in order that there should be appropriations for deserving localities. I complain against the system of passing such bills in their entirety, and their approval by the President in their entirety. What we need is a few amendments to the Constitution, so that this kind of so-called "pork-barrel legislation" is impossible, and with that end in view, I have introduced a resolution providing for the amending of section 7, part 2 of the Constitution of the United States, so that the President may approve or disapprove appropriation bills item by item. This would be the first great step in the right direction. If it were known that the President would veto unworthy projects, in bills of this character, those kind of undeserving items would be left out of the bill. As it is now the President must either approve or disapprove this bill in its entirety. Take for instance the appropriation provided for Ashtabula Harbor in my friend COOPER'S district. A very worthy project, and he will be obliged to vote for the bill or be classed as a hypocrite. If the President had the power under the Constitution he could approve such an item as Ashtabula Harbor and disapprove those that were not deserving. All waterway improvements should be restricted to navigation and to places where the commerce justified it. Many of these projects are solely for the benefit of one corporation or concern. I shall vote against this bill as a protest to the system, hoping that something may be done in the near future to make pork-barrel legislation impossible. I shall vote against this bill although it contains an item for my city. I did not introduce the bill to provide for the appropriation for my city. I did not urge the placing of it in this bill. I did not appear before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to urge the placing of this appropriation in the bill, and as far as this bill is concerned, I come before the House with clean hands. Congress has been passing omnibus bills that have grown in size and extravagance with each succeeding Congress. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR] that the waterways and the railroads should be placed under one head as far as Government regulation is concerned, and thus whatever is done in the line of improving of rivers and harbors could be done in conjunction

with the railroad system of the country, and be done where the greatest good would come to commerce. But I am told this old method has been the system of doing business of this kind for many years, and if a Member desires to get a worthy project provided for he must submit to bills of this character. I admit it has been the system, but Congress should do something to kill the system. There will be Members of this House who voted against the public-buildings bill who will vote for this principally because the rivers and harbors bill has an appropriation for some place in their district. A system that forces Members to do this is viciously wrong.

I shall not discuss the present condition of the Federal Treasury at this time other than to say that the Committee on Ways and Means are going to recommend an increase of 50 per cent on the inheritance tax. All I can say is that if this is to be done, I would advise those who are contemplating death that they better attend to it before this new tax becomes a law.

I had a provision in the public-buildings bill that carried an appropriation for Painesville, Ohio, in my district. I had introduced the bill, appeared before the Committee of Public Buildings, and, although I did not approve of the omnibus bill in which it was reported, I still voted for the bill, because I was responsible for this item in the bill. I could have sat quietly and voted against the bill and still my appropriation would have been provided for, yet I would have been a hypocrite. When I introduced the bill for a post office for Painesville, I was not acquainted with the system. I became an innocent victim but will not be such again.

A suggestion made by our distinguished Speaker when the public-buildings bill was before the House would apply very well in this bill. Rivers and harbors where the commerce justified it should be improved. Harbors where there were railroad terminals should be considered. Rivers where there were railroad facilities paralleling them should wait on localities that have poor transportation.

Projects are provided for in part, and no provision is made for the completion of the project. No project should be undertaken unless the plan has been carefully made for the ultimate completion of the project. The question of national defense should also figure somewhat, and in fact a good deal in these projects.

Of course, Governments can not conduct their business the way private concerns do. Perhaps if the initiative, referendum, and the recall applied to President and Members of Congress we might get better legislation. We recently provided for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people. I have heard of no complaint because of this change. Some people think the President should be elected for one term. I believe if he expects to run for a second term he will make a better official than if he knows he can only have one term. I doubt, if the President was not running for reelection last fall, that the Adamson eight-hour bill would ever have passed Congress and become a law. That was legislation in the right direction, and observe Members here are very watchful as to how the folks back home feel before they vote on propositions. A Member who lives in a wet district easily fixes his conscience so that he can vote against prohibition here, and a Member who lives in a dry district votes dry, although often his conduct is not in accord with his vote.

And so legislation goes on, and I expect will go on when we are dead and forgotten. But I trust that Congress will at this session do something to correct this great error of pork-barrel legislation by at least giving the President a right to veto these appropriation bills item by item, and thus take one step in the right direction.

It is interesting to note how Members of this House vote on certain bills. For instance, of the Members who voted against the public-buildings bill the following either voted to increase the allowance to themselves for clerk hire or were paired in favor of the increase:

MESSRS. CARTER of Massachusetts, DALLINGER, DILL, DOOLITTLE, ELLSWORTH, FESS, GANDY, GARDNER, GLYNN, GREENE of Vermont, HICKS, JOHNSON of South Dakota, KEISTER, LOUD, McARTHUR, MAHER, MILLER of Delaware, NOLAN, REAVIS, SCHALL, WALSH, WILLIAMS, WINSLOW, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

I shall watch with interest how many Members who voted against the public-buildings bill vote for this river and harbor bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COLEMAN].

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman and Members of Congress, on January 6, 1917, there was introduced in this House a bill now known as H. R. 19730, providing an eight-hour workday for certain railway employees, preventing a strike of such em-

ployees pending investigation and authorizing the President of the United States under conditions set forth to draft these employees into the military service of the United States. In so far as this bill seeks to provide an eight-hour workday it differs from the original Adamson enactment in that it does not attempt to fix wages and thus avoids a strong constitutional objection. It is not my purpose to discuss this feature of the bill nor the section pertaining to the military draft. But rather I invite the attention of the House to the provision relating to arbitration and to a discussion of the question of compulsory arbitration in general.

And in considering a compulsory-arbitration measure we are confronted not only with the right of the public to thus interfere with the private relations of employer and employee, but also with the practicability of such a law.

Now, it is apparent that a great coal strike, such as occurred in the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania some years ago, or in the Colorado fields more recently, or a street railway strike similar to that with which the metropolis of New York was a short time since afflicted, or a national railway tie up, necessarily causes great inconvenience to the public and affords grounds for arguing the right of that public to interfere through the law-making body to prevent such inconvenience.

No one, then, is going to defend the strike as a good thing in itself. On the other hand, there will be general agreement to the statement that it is a great economic waste. Members of labor unions know this just as well as the public do. They know also that to them it means hard work and anxious hours as they wait the uncertain outcome. And because of this they are averse to strikes and avoid resorting to them except in extreme cases, but when such cases do arise they hold it as their right to thus contend with their employers for the principle that may happen to be involved.

And, personally, I am rather pleased that they do so contend, for it indicates a strong feeling among the mass of workmen for the maintenance of individual rights in opposition to the radicalism of present-day socialistic tendencies. And argue it as you may, and let Socialist leaders, for political effect, oppose it as they will, the fact remains that compulsory arbitration is of socialistic flavor, and if adopted as a principle of our Government we will have entered into the borderland of that system which would destroy competition and make the State the owner of all.

In deciding our course as to compulsory arbitration, now that the election is over, it is to be hoped that we will be influenced by fundamental principles more than by the voting strength of labor unions. But, if influenced by the latter consideration in this particular instance, in my judgment justice will be more nearly achieved than it was by the passage of the Adamson wage-fixing law in the last session of Congress.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. MEEKER (during the count). I shall withdraw the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the point of order.

Mr. COLEMAN. I wish here to say that the settlement or postponement of the threatened railroad strike of August last by the enactment of the Adamson law was in effect compulsory arbitration, and when the Federation of Labor and the railroad brotherhoods aided in its passage they also aided in forging the chains of a compulsory-arbitration law. And these organizations, which have grown into such giants of power, would do well to review the history and struggles of labor organizations of past generations before plunging themselves further into the clutches of Government authority.

PAST HISTORY.

It may not be out of place here to call attention to the fact that fixing wages by law is no new thing. In the middle of the fourteenth century an English law obliged men without means of their own "to serve him which so shall require"; the wages were fixed, and refusal to work at the rate was punished with imprisonment. In the middle of the sixteenth century a law was passed forbidding conspiracies not to work but at a certain rate, and later in the same century a further enactment provided that those not possessed of independent means or other employments were bound to work as artificers or laborers on demand, the hours of labor being fixed and authority given to justices to set the wages. Under George the First in the eighteenth century a law was enacted to punish with imprisonment journeymen tailors and other employees for entering into an agreement to advance wages or decrease hours of employ-

ment, while under George the Third in 1800 a similar provision was extended to all workmen.

English decisions throughout the eighteenth and well up into the nineteenth century held that it was criminal conspiracy for workmen to bind themselves together to enforce higher wages. This was the rule under the common law, and, as I have shown, many statutes were passed fixing the rate of pay, and any attempt on the part of the workmen to conspire against the statute rate was punished with imprisonment. Are these the conditions to which workingmen wish to return? Is the liberty which the workingman now enjoys, after years of toil and struggle, to be surrendered to the wisdom of legislative bodies?

In our country as in England during the first half of the nineteenth century attempts of workingmen to improve their conditions were punished as conspiracies. In New York as late as 1835 it was held that a strike of journeymen shoemakers to raise wages was injurious to trade and commerce and punishable as a conspiracy. In a Pittsburgh case in 1815 dealing with striking cordwaniers, in which the strikers were found guilty by a jury, the reporter in his notes has this to say:

The verdict of that jury is most important to the manufacturing interests of this community. It puts an end to those associations which have been so prejudicial to the successful enterprise of the capitalists of the western country.

It was not until about the middle of the century that courts began to see another side to these controversies, and in the interpretation of the constitutional provisions making for the protection of individual rights recognized the justice of the demands of labor organizations for improved wages and conditions of employment and in an effort to secure the same the legality of the strike.

It was about this same time that labor unions, by reason of the changed conditions resulting from the development of our industrial system, causing master and servant to become separate and distinct parties rather than partners, were established in the sense in which they are now known. By this time England's unjust combination laws were so far modified through the influence of a fair public opinion as to permit workmen to organize for what was considered the legal aim of regulating wages and hours of labor by the right of the strike. And this right gained after years of struggle against the old combination and conspiracy laws they are not now willing to surrender and they can not afford to allow Congress to arrogate to itself the right to pass compulsory arbitration or Adamson wage-fixing laws and deprive them of their rights as individuals or of their rights by collective bargaining to determine the terms of their employment.

The right of labor organizations to strike is now generally conceded by the courts of this country, State and National; this is especially true when the object of the strike is to increase wages, fix hours of labor, or in other ways directly affect the conditions of employment. And this right was gained through the diffusion of the doctrine of individual and personal rights as understood by the founders of our Government, prompting, as this diffusion did, a struggle against the spirit of medievalism, with its class distinctions and antagonisms to the working class. And in our effort to keep abreast with the changed public opinion of to-day we must be careful not to abandon basic principles while seeking to interpret them in the light of present-day surroundings.

The modern labor union proceeds on fairly conservative lines and in the main is under the direction of able leaders, for which it is to be commended. Its object is the just one of protecting its members and improving their conditions of employment. And it is in the capacity for collective bargaining that its strength lies, and by reason of this power its members can demand and often obtain a fair share of the profits of the business in the form of wages. Shall we by law take this right from them and place them at the mercy of compulsory-arbitration tribunals and force them to work, as was done under the old English statutes, for the wages fixed by law? I do not believe that we should. Certainly such action should not be taken unless some great benefit is to accrue to the men involved or the public generally. And what good reason can be advanced to convince us that the arbitral tribunal can solve the problems at issue between employers and employees to better advantage than they themselves, in the exercise of their lawful rights to deal freely one with the other in the adjustment of their differences?

I argue that compulsory arbitration is wrong in principle, that it is contrary to the spirit of our institutions, that it is in violation of the individual rights of the members of labor unions, and that in the interest of industrial justice we should not deprive labor organizations in their collective capacity of the right to strike if need be to obtain fair terms of employment,

and I further contend that under the conditions with which we are surrounded in this country compulsory arbitration is impracticable.

PUBLIC RIGHTS.

In thus contending I am not unmindful of the strength of the argument in favor of the right of the injured public to interfere in some measure in the adjustment of industrial disputes. Industries of different kinds are so correlated that a stoppage of one vitally affects others and often works great public injury. For this reason able men argue, and public sentiment in many countries supports them, that the public has a right to compel arbitration.

Most European nations prohibit in some degree workmen engaged in public utilities from striking. But we must not overlook the fact that in some of those countries these laws apply to the employees of state owned and operated railways and to other public works.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does the gentleman think that Congress has any authority to pass a law prohibiting a man from quitting work if he wants to do so?

Mr. COLEMAN. I do not believe that Congress has that authority. I believe that the Adamson wage-fixing law passed at the last session of Congress is unconstitutional, and I believe compulsory arbitration laws would likewise be unconstitutional. In this connection I want to say to the gentleman that in this city of Washington in December last there was an interesting colloquy between Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, and Prof. John R. Commons, of the University of Wisconsin. In that discussion between Mr. Gompers and Mr. Commons the president of the American Federation of Labor asserted that compulsory arbitration was unconstitutional, and, among other things, said:

INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE.

I call the attention of this conference to the fact that there is a provision in the Constitution of the United States against involuntary servitude except as a punishment for crime after trial and conviction. Therefore a law which would make strikes illegal must of necessity carry with it involuntary servitude. Compulsory service is unconstitutional and is un-American and makes for unfreedom.

In *Arthur v. Oaks* (83 Fed., 310), Justice Harlan, with reference to the restraining of an individual from leaving the personal service of another, said:

One who is placed under such a constraint is in a condition of involuntary servitude—a condition which the supreme law of the land declares shall not exist within the United States or in any place subject to its jurisdiction.

This is substantial authority for the contention of Mr. Gompers, and certainly justifies him in raising the question of constitutionality.

Mr. George P. West, in an article appearing in the *New Republic*, September 30, 1916, opposes the view of the editor of that publication in his indorsement of the President's railway program, and says:

We could disregard the objection that such prohibition constitutes the imposition of involuntary servitude, provided no substantial injury was inflicted on the man thus compelled to remain temporarily at work.

But would not very substantial injury be inflicted, he asks? He then proceeds to show how in the interim between the filing of the demands of the men and the submission of the report of the investigating committee great injury would be wrought to the employees by the discharge of some, by extensive advertising, and in other ways.

The editor in reply says:

We do not agree with Mr. West that compulsory investigation is the same as compulsory arbitration. We do agree with him that compulsory investigation imposed after the threat of a strike would, under present conditions, often work injustice to the employees in some occupations.

Our proposal is more specific and rests on certain presuppositions. It presupposes that unions should have already been organized and the right of collective bargaining recognized by the community. It presupposes that the nonarbitrable principles which must underlie labor controversies, such as the eight-hour day as a basis of wage computation, shall have been established in legislation.

And let me say that if the principle of wage fixing by legislation involved in the Adamson law is to be considered as established and is upheld by the Supreme Court, then I will have to agree with the reasoning of the editor. But I do not believe in that principle, and I do not believe in compulsory arbitration. The principle involved in either case is in contravention of our theory of government, which is designed to protect the fundamental rights of its citizens against legislative encroachment, and in this respect my attitude is consistent, and I call attention to the inconsistent stand of Samuel Gompers and the railroad brotherhoods in supporting the same principle in the Adamson law that they so forcefully condemn in compulsory arbitration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLEMAN. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman, if we have the power to prevent a man from striking, what distinction is there between that and the power to compel him to continue his work? If you compel a man not to strike, is not that in substance compelling him to continue on with his labor?

Mr. COLEMAN. As I said to the gentleman in answer to a previous question, I do not believe we have the right constitutionally to pass this legislation, and there is little difference between his former question and the proposition he has now presented, and I wish further to say, if we do have the right, if the law is enacted, I know of no way by which even the power of this Government could force 400,000 men to go back to their employment if they chose not to do so.

IS IT PRACTICAL?

I know that some of our leading publications are in favor of the President's program, believe that it is practical, and go so far as to advocate the compulsory enforcement of the award. One of these is the *Independent* or *Harper's Weekly*. It dwells upon the public interest and the suffering and distress incident to strikes, and, with reference to the milk strike in New York, says:

The public stood by helpless and suffered while two groups in the community fought out their commercial differences. * * *

And further:

The well-being of all should never be permitted to suffer because some special portion of the whole is seeking its own well-being in its own way.

It then proceeds to reason that if a solution is not found for a peaceful settlement of these disputes Government ownership and operation will be rapidly accelerated.

But it does not follow that a peaceful solution for these disputes is possible nor does it follow that compulsory arbitration will prove more workable or of better advantage to the public, nor does it follow that government ownership and operation would solve the problem. For if the Government had to deal with the great mass of employees it would not mean the end of strikes.

Perhaps military mobilization would accomplish the result, but is it possible to conceive of the people of this country quietly submitting to such a degree of Government authority over them in respect to purely civil affairs?

In discussing a report of a committee appointed by a prominent French society—the *Société d'Etudes Législatives*—in 1913, Mr. Heurteau, delegate general of the management of the Orleans Railway, strongly opposed compulsory arbitration and in answering the arguments advanced as to the successful operation of the Canadian act called attention to the Canadian Pacific strike of 1908 and the Grand Trunk strike of 1910, each lasting for a period of two months, and said:

Hence one could not say that in Canada and in England conciliation boards had formed an effective means for the peaceful settlement of labor conflicts.

In Australia compulsory arbitration has not put an end to strikes, and in that country the people are trained to the belief that Government is all powerful and can enact legislation in its sovereign power to compel obedience by all, while in this country we are reared in the atmosphere that individual rights, personal rights, and property rights are in a large measure protected from legislative authority, and will as a result be less inclined to accept as final the award of an arbitration board.

When interrupted by the gentleman from Washington a short time ago, I was discussing the laws in European nations with respect to compulsory arbitration, and in a strongly centralized Government like Germany we find that membership in trades-unions is looked upon as being incompatible with loyalty to the State.

In contrast with this we find that in England, where the liberty of the individual, as in our own land, is firmly established, trade unions flourish. And while recognizing the evils of strikes efforts to curb them have been confined to conciliation boards, and these boards served as the foundation for the Canadian conciliation and labor act of 1900, from which was developed the industrial-disputes act of 1907, after which the proposed law is patterned.

The reports as to the working of the Canadian disputes act have been more or less favorable, and yet it is to be noted that strikes have not been eliminated under its operation, and further that the trades-unions are strong in their demands for its repeal. It would seem but natural that with our larger industrial population, and the jealousy with which we look upon the exercise

of governmental power in the private affairs of individuals that a similar law would not work as well with us as it does in Canada.

It is in Australia and New Zealand that we find the most radical legislation along these lines. In New Zealand and the Colony of New South Wales we find compulsory arbitration of a pronounced nature, but strikes still continue and are quite as numerous if not more so than in our own country.

Under the Canadian system of compulsory investigation and the Australian system of compulsory arbitration the strike remains, and when it does come the Government finds itself unable to compel a great army of strikers to return to their employment. Considering further that in Australia and New Zealand, the home of compulsory arbitration, the conditions have been most favorable to the successful working of such a law in that they are new countries and the period during which it has been tried has been one of rising prices and correspondingly of rising wages we should realize that the experiment does not justify our following the example.

Rising prices are naturally followed by rising wages, as is evidenced by the recent advances of wages in this country in many industrial concerns without any threat of a strike, as in the United States Steel Corporation; and the wonder is that this Congress, which so willingly voted to raise the wages of certain railroad employees 25 per cent, would not make some honest effort to increase the wages of Government employees to meet the conditions now prevailing as a result of high prices. If the Adamson law should be upheld as constitutional perhaps we will change the order of wages following prices, and in the future have prices follow wages. Just how far we will get in this direction remains to be seen, but it seems to be the trend of the times.

When we consider the vast difference in the conditions that surround Australia and New Zealand and those with which we are surrounded, the fact that the former countries are to a great extent isolated, while we enter into keen competition with the leading countries of the world, the immense difference in population and the rising market in those new countries during the period in which compulsory arbitration has been in vogue, it would seem to me that no good reason presents itself for the inaugurating of such a system in our midst. This reasoning is the stronger by reason of our being reared in an atmosphere in which the natural rights of individuals are held, or were until recently, as sacred as among the Romans. And in view of these considerations may we not well pause to inquire whether or not compulsory arbitration in our surroundings would work good or evil results?

LIMITED GOVERNMENTAL POWER.

It is true that our Government, though of limited legislative power, has gone far in recent years in the direction of State regulation and control, and we seem to be fast approaching the system of government against which the Monroe doctrine was enunciated as a protest as well as a protection to our institutions. Monroe in his famous message, among other things, said:

The political system of the allied powers is essentially different from that of America. * * * It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness.

In the Senate of the United States, on January 8 of this year, there was introduced a resolution to forbid Federal judges declaring an act of Congress unconstitutional, thereby seeking to establish in this country a government of unlimited legislative authority. Are we now ready to abandon our system of limited governmental power, which is the vital distinction between us and the Governments of Europe? If we are, then the Monroe doctrine and our boasted superiority must be abandoned in face of our surrender to the European system.

Unlimited legislative authority was the rule in Governments previous to the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, which instrument breathed a new theory for the protection of the inalienable rights of man, which theory was incorporated in our Constitution and is still, in my humble judgment, so far in advance of the old idea that it should be carefully guarded and sacredly preserved.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman think there is any danger of the bill that has been introduced in Congress passing Congress and becoming a law?

Mr. COLEMAN. I do think there is danger. The fact is that the President of the United States is making an earnest effort to have that bill passed at the present session of Congress.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. COLEMAN. I do.

Mr. DENISON. Does not the gentleman think the President is letting up just a little bit on that?

Mr. COLEMAN. No. I will say that I do not; that I believe the President of the United States is earnest in his endeavors to have this bill passed.

I will say further, with reference to the President of the United States in this connection, that if the Adamson law, passed in the last session, is to be upheld as a constitutional law, then we must give credit to the President for a consistent program of legislation in insisting on the compulsory arbitration law. But, my friends, I do not believe that that law passed in the last session is constitutional. I do not believe that it can stand the test before the courts. I believe it violates the same principle as the compulsory arbitration law violates, and that neither one of them should be placed on the statute books in this country.

Mr. FESS. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I agree with you entirely that compulsory arbitration will be a very bad thing. I think I agree with you entirely, too, that we are not ready for Government ownership in operation of railroads. But what should be our duty here when a scene takes place again such as took place here in the latter part of August, choosing between a threat that the country will be tied up if we do not pass certain legislation? Do you not think that compulsory arbitration under those circumstances will be justified?

Mr. COLEMAN. No; I do not believe that compulsory arbitration is any answer to the base surrender of this Congress to the 400,000 railroad men. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. That is good.

Mr. COLEMAN. If it is wrong it is not to be enacted for any reason.

Now, I admit if the Adamson wage-fixing law is to be the law of the land we must come to compulsory arbitration, as there is no other way out, unless, as the gentleman says, we go to Government ownership. And let me say right here in that connection that if we did go to Government ownership that would not mean that strikes would be at an end. Suppose the Government owned and operated the railways, does that mean the men would not strike if the wages that they asked for were not sufficient, in their judgment?

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS.

In our rapid change of ideas we must not wander too far from basic principles and we should not forget in our movement toward greater socialization that the preservation of individual rights is still a great concern of government, and to this end we have our government of legally limited power. And in considering the virtue of individual and personal rights we should ponder carefully before taking away from the members of labor unions their rights, either in their individual or collective capacity to make contracts with their employers and to use all fair and lawful means at their disposal to procure good wages and reasonable hours of labor.

Of course, if it be granted that we have the authority to fix the wages of employees in public-service corporations doing an interstate business, as we attempted by the Adamson law in the last session of Congress, then I agree, as already stated, that the President rightly contends for arbitration of a compulsory nature. But, believing that we do not have that right and that the Adamson law, in so far as it attempts to fix wages, must fall as an unconstitutional enactment, I contend that we ought not to pass a compulsory arbitration law. And whatever the interest of the public in the controversy that public must remember that they can not deprive employer or employee of their individual rights without thereby endangering their own liberties.

Compulsory arbitration violates the principles that underlie the American system of government and is an unwarranted interference with individual rights. The fact that other Governments have similar laws is not a compelling reason for us to follow in their footsteps. The systems are different and the difference makes to the advantage of our system.

If we enter upon the dangerous practice of fixing wages by law—and this is what compulsory arbitration does, just as it was done or attempted by the Adamson law—then we are going to place, of necessity, a strain on our legislative department too great for it to bear.

LABOR.

The American Federationist of December, after making effort to justify the Adamson law, says, with reference to the compulsory arbitration proposed by the President:

It is a revolutionary proposition totally out of harmony with our prevailing institutions and out of harmony with our philosophy of government.

And in this I agree with them. The strange thing is that while so correctly judging this proposition they should have been blinded to support the Adamson law which to a greater extent than compulsory arbitration is out of harmony with our philosophy of government.

The passage of that bill, so contrary to the spirit of our institutions, followed, as it is now being followed, by the sturdy advocacy of a compulsory-arbitration law, proves the correctness of the reasoning in that same December number of the American Federationist, as follows:

In human institutions when a wrongful course has been pursued it inevitably is held or driven on to its logical conclusion of error.

I can not but feel that the members of the American Federation of Labor and of the railroad brotherhoods would have been infinitely better off if, instead of supporting the Adamson law and the administration responsible for its enactment, they had steadfastly adhered to the doctrine theretofore long advocated that government had no right to interfere with the regulation of wages or hours of service of adult workmen.

How well the members of the executive council of the Federation reason when they state:

Problems of industrial justice and redress for industrial wrongs can not be worked out by laws. Human relationships are involved, and these can be adjusted on a basis of equity only through cooperation and mutual consent.

I agree with them, and believe in the principle underlying this reasoning, and because of this belief I voted against the Adamson law, and for the same reason will vote against compulsory arbitration, involving, as it does, practically the same issue as the Adamson law. The precedent of the Adamson enactment and its support by labor unions that had previously and consistently opposed such legislation will prove detrimental, not helpful, to labor organizations; and the time, I trust, is near at hand when they will acknowledge their error in having aided a measure so vitally wrong in principle.

THE CANADIAN ACT.

I have already referred to the Canadian act, and said that the proposed law copies after it. This act, passed in 1907, is applicable to industries connected with public utilities, and declares that strikes and lockouts may not occur legally in these industries until after efforts at adjustment have been made through the official machinery provided.

The board consists of three members, two being appointed by the respective parties and the third by the labor minister. Penalties are provided if any strike takes place before the board recommends a solution.

The State of Colorado has adopted the principle of the Canadian law, and one of the members of the industrial commission of that State, as set forth in the Outlook of October, 1916, writing to that magazine with reference to this Colorado law, says:

It has done more to promote industrial peace than anything ever tried in this State. Had this law been in operation in the Nation last month I believe there would have been no such crisis as confronted us at that time.

The Outlook editorial says, in response to this statement:

There is, in our judgment, good ground for this opinion.

They then proceed to advocate a compulsory-arbitration law that would go further than the Canadian act by enforcing the award of the court of arbitration.

It must be remembered, however, that the Colorado act has been in effect only since 1915, and has not therefore been subject to any real test. It must be noted also that in August last the trade-unions of Colorado were united in their opposition to this law and pledged themselves to work for its repeal. Nor have I seen any evidence of the employers being pleased with its provisions.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman have any suggestion to make that might lead to the stopping of strikes? Does he know of anything that would stop them?

Mr. COLEMAN. I know of no other way or no better way than the provisions that we already have in the Newlands Act. I believe in voluntary arbitration. It is in harmony with our Government institutions, and we ought to abide by it and encourage it in every way, as they do in England. Under the Newlands Act we have provision and machinery for the voluntary settlement of these disputes between employers and employees, and I do not know of any better way, I wish to say to my friend, than voluntary arbitration for the settling of these disputes in consideration of the principles of individual liberty, of which I am a firm adherent. And I look with concern upon the rapidity with which this Congress is foregoing these principles and marching headlong into socialism under the leadership of the other side.

VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION.

As I have said, in our country, as in England, legislation has been confined to voluntary arbitration enactments. Now, there is a vast difference between voluntary and compulsory arbitration. In the former all of us believe, and the principle involved is in harmony with our theory of government, especially the preservation of individual rights.

We now rely on the Newlands Act for the settlement of grave industrial disputes, and it is probably an improvement over the Erdman law which preceded it in that it provides for six arbitrators instead of three, and therefore does not leave the decision of an important question to but one person. Perhaps the most important settlement under its provisions was that of the firemen's and engineers' strike in the West in 1914, with which decision there was great dissatisfaction among the men.

If dissatisfied under voluntary arbitration as is now provided, will there not be greater dissatisfaction with the award under compulsory provisions, and will not the men resent the more the fact that they are forced to accept an unsatisfactory award? And, even though the power of the Government is back of that award, does it insure against the strike?

There is such strong opposition to compulsory arbitration, both among employers and employees, that it would seem a most unsatisfactory law and one that it would be most difficult to enforce. Under these circumstances is it not pertinent to ask as to the practicability of a compulsory law?

Labor is united in its opposition to the recommendation of the President relative to arbitration, and yet it was labor that largely contributed to his reelection, and inasmuch as he had previously in a message to Congress clearly stated his views on this subject, may it not be asked with reason if labor does not now find itself in a somewhat embarrassing position.

To labor then I say, yours was a short-sighted vision when you indorsed the Adamson wage-fixing law involving the same principle that underlies compulsory arbitration, and you can not retain its fruits without thereby endangering your liberties.

To employers of labor who, striving under the difficulties of severe Government regulations to successfully operate their businesses, and who for this reason may be prompted to favor the same exercise of authority over the individual rights of their employees, I wish to sound this warning: You can not afford to further encourage Government interference with private rights, and you should be more concerned in protecting the basic principle than in seeking by legislation to control the rights and liberties of your employees.

To my mind the Government already exercises a too great control over private business, and has by the severity of its restrictions prevented railroad construction that is required by the business interests of the country. More, it has by reason of this control arrayed one business interest against another and caused various groups to demand Government aid for its own interests and Government restriction of the interests of other groups. And if this aid and restriction is continued as a permanent governmental policy it must lead of necessity to State socialism.

Personally, I am a firm adherent of individual and property rights, and am opposed to the law-making body encroaching further upon them by Adamson wage-fixing measures or compulsory-arbitration enactments. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FEAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL.

Mr. FEAR. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may not be interrupted until I have talked 25 minutes, if the Chair will notify me at the end of that time, because I wish to make a statement as clearly as possible, and at the conclusion of 25 minutes I shall be glad to receive any interruption.

A question was presented immediately after the meeting of the House to-day in which it was suggested that a great publica-

tion in New York had sent out some copies of my speech under frank. Let me say that I paid for every one of the copies and furnished them to anyone who asked for them, and these were asked for, and I presume the franks were sent by my office. They would not exceed, in number, 500, I am satisfied. I shall be glad to pay the postage bill if any possible criticism can arise, because I do not want it to be accepted as a condition or precedent for anyone else.

Let me add this: I believe that the magazines and newspapers of this country that are fearlessly striking at waste and extravagance, which many of us concede to-day exists in legislation, are performing a great public service. They are awakening public opinion on this kind of omnibus-bill legislation. I may say again, as I have said in the past, criticism of projects does not always fall upon those who accept it cordially. At this time I desire to express to the chairman of this committee, who stated to-day he was about to leave us, my hearty appreciation for his kindness extended to me at all times and under all circumstances. He is an optimist, and he certainly is a courteous man under all conditions. I realize that some things that have been said and done in committee have not been calculated to bring us close together, but he has always been generous in his treatment and in his criticisms, and I for one am very sorry indeed that he is to leave this House, because I think he has been a valued Member since he has been here.

Let me add to that, Mr. Chairman, that there are a number of members of that committee who will not be with us next time. Some of them have at times felt that criticisms aimed at particular projects were not fair from their standpoint. In committee and out those gentlemen have been very generous with me—very kind—and I have not a single objection to find to the treatment that has been accorded to me by them throughout. I do not object to personal criticism. I am not on trial. It is the policy of this Congress that is to be placed on trial, and that is what is being discussed to-day in the public press. Are we doing right to pass bills like the one before us and one like the public-buildings bill?

It does not answer to say that this man or that man is inconsistent in his statements. That is beside the question. The only thing to discuss is, Are we legislating aright? And, if not, can we improve the conditions?

We have just passed a \$38,000,000 bill for public buildings. The Treasury Department said that 200 and more of those projects ought not to have been placed in the bill because they were extravagant. Those facts were shown on the floor. Yet, not one item could be stricken from the bill. We all know why it was. We do not have to question each other to ascertain why we could not strike them out—some of those bad items.

Then, here is a bill of \$38,000,000 more, the same kind of a bill in some respects, where fully half of it, as I believe can be demonstrated, will be waste. But it is going to pass this House, and all the support that you can bring against any single amendment will not serve to strike it out of the bill.

The chairman of this committee said I was a pessimist. Ah, that may be true. But there were over 140 other pessimists in this House last time when they sought to defeat the bill, and practically half of the Members of the Senate of the United States were pessimists last time, because they came within 1 vote of defeating the bill. They were pessimists from that standpoint. But is that a standard of pessimism?

I have attempted to point out waste from a sense of duty in a kindly spirit, because there is no personal feeling in the matter whatsoever, and I believe it is so understood by the House. We are facing a deficit of \$300,000,000, it is said. The chairman of the committee answers that by saying this is a wealthy country. That is true. But the people in my State are paying taxes to put through these public buildings and waterways, and they are paying direct taxes. If the projects are necessary and desirable they ought to do it. But if it is waste it is wicked to compel those people to pay this money in face of the facts. It is criminal to compel them to pay for waste by direct taxation, and that is what I object to.

Mr. Chairman, this bill reaches \$38,000,000 in round numbers, but that is not the entire bill at all. Those figures do not begin to state all that is in the bill. Nine million dollars is for new projects. Oh, yes; that means for 80 new projects that were put into the bill between January 5 and January 11, with only five legislative days intervening; 80 additional new projects put in the bill. Eighty projects distributed all over this country, and they will bring votes to the bill. The new projects have been placed in the bill on top of a couple of hundred or more old projects. Some of them doubtless are good. The New York projects may be good. I presume some of them are all right. But you never could get your projects for New York until we

begin to open up on these wasteful projects. Some of the projects are not good and are not defensible. In Germany they compel contributions in most cases unless it is a governmental function. Here it is a grab. The strongest influence is the one that counts. The greatest pressure is brought to bear. I can mention you cases where Senators and Congressmen go before the different boards of Army engineers and insist that their projects should be taken into consideration. Why, how can a Senator or a Congressman know anything technically about these projects? Yet that influence is directly exercised, according to these reports.

I have suggested in this statement of mine, presenting the minority views, that each project, beginning on four rivers, which takes \$18,000,000, is, according to the demands of the Army engineers. I say "demands" advisedly. In all of these four river projects not a single dollar was stricken out by the committee. It was an autocratic demand. I can not conceive of it being anything else, except where I moved to strike out \$800,000 on the upper Mississippi River. I have not technical knowledge, but my motion went through unanimously in spite of the engineer's recommendation.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] contends that we can not do otherwise than follow the engineer's recommendations, because the engineers are authority for determining, and when they say \$2,000,000 for the upper Mississippi or \$6,000,000 for the lower Mississippi, or a million dollars for the Beaufort Canal, those are their figures, and we can not change them. In some cases their figures have been cut, but only to a slight extent, and in the one case I presented—\$800,000—reached nearly one-half of the entire cut on 200 projects.

The chairman of the committee said I made some statements that he believed were incorrect in the minority report. It is true I did my work hurriedly, but I challenge the chairman to point to misstatements in that report. There perhaps may be misstatements in it, but the chairman has not shown them thus far.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is the minority report?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will satisfy the gentleman before long.

Mr. FREAR. When the chairman was discussing comparative appropriations on page 2, he forgot to read that they were for old projects. I put it there expressly. When I was speaking, on page 2, of the various harbor improvements, that was expressly stated. There may be errors in preparing a report of this kind, and probably will be in preparing a long speech such as appeared the other day. No man is infallible. But if there are any errors, they were not made consciously. I am glad to correct any error that may be here.

But that is not the question. The question is, Is this method of legislation right? Is it right to legislate by these omnibus bills as we are doing, putting a little appropriation here and a little one there, and so on, all over the United States until the whole country is covered in one bill? Then the votes are tied together and all must stand or fall together. During the discussion of the bill I shall have only a few minutes to talk on each project, and I do not wish to take the time of the House unnecessarily. I do not expect to change votes here. I do expect, however, to try to make a record, and that record will be used elsewhere, as it has been used in the past. I want that record to be correct and honest. If there is any mistake made, I shall be glad to correct it. There is no object nor gain in misstating facts.

As to the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, for instance, of which my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] thinks so much—and I do not blame him—for of course he and I have different angles from which to view these questions. He feels that it is a very important project, and he is very anxious about it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FREAR. In a moment. He believes that it is a national project. It is a project that means a part of some great scheme of preparedness. He wants not a 12-foot canal, or a 25-foot canal, to meet Admiral Benson's request, but it will soon be a demand for a 35-foot canal in order to make connections with the Delaware River. What is the estimate on that? About \$22,000,000, if I remember correctly; but that does not meet the preparedness plan. Right on top of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal plan Admiral Benson and Army engineers say it is equally necessary to put a canal through New Jersey so that the fleet can go from Philadelphia to New York by way of this inland waterway.

That canal will cost \$45,000,000 for a 25-foot depth; but if you are going to build it so that it will carry great vessels of the Navy and to be of practicable value, it will cost, presumably, \$75,000,000, because the cost increases rapidly with the depth.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows there must be a beginning.

Mr. FREAR. And that is only a part of the canal preparedness scheme, because from Norfolk down to Beaufort, 200 miles, if you are going to have a 35-foot canal there to accommodate large craft, you are going to spend \$50,000,000 or more. If it is a scheme of preparedness, make it mean preparedness. If it is a question of commerce, then let it stand upon its own bottom. That is the Delaware & Chesapeake new project I am speaking about. I wish I had half an hour to discuss it. I have read the reports quite thoroughly. And let me say just one thing that shows up the unfairness of this bill. It provides an initial payment of \$1,300,000, when Army engineers say \$2,500,000 must be appropriated as the first expense. And that additional amount will go on in the Senate; but here, in order to keep down the appearance and the total of the bill, we appropriate only \$1,300,000, when every one of us knows it must be added to in the Senate, or it might as well be taken out of the bill. That is a \$22,000,000 project; only \$8,000,000 for a 12-foot project, but the larger sum is for a deeper channel, to be of preparedness value.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think the Government would save money by making the larger appropriation?

Mr. FREAR. I will discuss that at the proper time in the five-minute discussion. There is the Oklawaha River, a project which is a new project put in the bill with the Kissimmee and others. That is a project that carried one thousand seven hundred and sixty-odd tons of commerce after deducting logs last year and after an expenditure of about \$100,000 by the Government. Now we are asked to expend \$733,000 more upon that project. I should like to discuss that later on. I can not now.

Mr. HULBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I have said I would yield in the last five minutes of my time. I desire to continue my statement now, so as to get it before the House.

There is the upper Mississippi River, which flows past my district. It carries a demand from the Army engineers—I say a demand, because that is what they make. Just think of it. I can, by a motion before our committee, ask to have it cut down \$800,000, and it is done. That is the only case, I assume, where a Member did such an act—my statement before the Army engineers. And that stands practically alone. What do you think of such a scientific method of determining the needs of the upper Mississippi? The upper Mississippi River, according to the report of one of the best captains on the river—I do not think there is any better man—says that \$30,000 a section on six sections, or \$180,000, is all that is needed for improvement, and that to-day the river is more dangerous than it was before a dollar of the \$28,000,000 had been expended. You say, "Have you any authority for that?" I am going to submit authorities on some of these matters that you will admit are good. I am going to submit the authority of the boatmen, pilots, and others on that river over their signatures as to the condition of the river. The river does not carry 10 per cent of the commerce that it carried 40 years ago. I know it because I have been there, and I know it from the statements of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce and of commercial boards, and I think the same is practically true of the lower Mississippi, which has had \$88,000,000. The upper Mississippi has had \$28,000,000. Take the Missouri River, that has had \$20,000,000. What have we gotten out of that? I see my good friend from Kansas City, Mr. BORLAND, sitting here. I am sorry to oppose that project, but it seems to me a waste of money, and that is the only reason why I oppose it. I do not think the Government is getting value received. That is the only reason I oppose these projects.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I have said I would yield in the last five minutes of my time. I can not understand how we can consistently favor the Missouri River project when so able a man as Col. Townsend, who to-day is the chairman of the Mississippi River Commission, agreed that it is not a worthy project. The Chief of Engineers wipes them all out and puts the project on the map, and so it stands to reach an eventual expenditure of \$35,000,000. And that is only one of them. It does not stand alone. That is the reason I say what we need is an investigation by a board that is unprejudiced, of all these projects, to get at the question thoroughly. Your good harbors, if you have them, will be taken care of; your good rivers will be taken care of. But you

can not lose sight of the fact that the Missouri River and the Mississippi River and the Ohio River have all lost commerce rapidly in the last 40 years.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. In the last five minutes of my time I will yield. These rivers have lost commerce, and during that time we have appropriated \$150,000,000 to the Mississippi River. We have appropriated or will appropriate \$90,000,000 for the Ohio River, and we are not getting the commerce. I realize that there are land-reclamation projects along these streams, and if that be the purpose you can carry it anywhere; but for navigation, which is what we propose in this bill, I can not see how you can possibly justify it.

Mr. Chairman, at the close of the bill I am going to offer a substitute which proposes to place a certain amount in the hands of the Army engineers. Gentlemen have asked me, "Do you believe they will divide it properly or that they will be fair?" No; I do not. I concede that they will not. I am not satisfied with their allotment. Then why do this? Because the total amount in this bill, if you count the new projects, reaches \$76,000,000, to which we are committed, and that, with the \$38,000,000, reaches \$114,000,000, substantially, and if you can put \$15,000,000 in their hands and require them to distribute it and allot it to the necessary old projects, it ought to be a saving, had it not? Because the limitation would compel them to spend less. Some of it may be wasted on poor projects, but it is better than to appropriate \$38,000,000 or \$45,000,000, as it will be before it gets through the Senate, probably, because some of the things that are not put on here will be put on there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this proposal does not meet my approval very strongly, and yet it is the only way that I can see whereby you can make the correction. That is the way the Senate did at the last time; they put in a lump-sum appropriation, and these appropriations were distributed, not fairly according to navigation needs, I concede, but there was a saving of \$42,000,000 by the defeat of the other two bills. That is my proposal briefly, in order to substitute for the bill before us.

I do not claim to be an expert in these matters. I simply say that I want the Government to receive full value for what it puts into these rivers and harbors all over the country. That is all, and that is something which is being brought home to us every time a bill of this kind comes up. Congress ought not to legislate on the matters of determining the commercial value of the different projects. How can you do it?

Some of the members in this committee—and I am one of them—were not present but at few meetings, and there are \$38,000,000 appropriated. I have read every new project in the report, and I want to ask everyone who stands up to defend them how they can defend \$76,000,000 out of 160 new projects substantially; how can you determine as to the merits in five days? Oh, they say, we have the reports before us. Yes; but who is able to read them, with all the other matters that you have had here; all of us engaged in legislation, endeavoring to do our duty? Some are engaged on other bills, trying to do their duty on other matters. It needs experts to study these questions throughout the year, analyze them, and see what the Government is going to get in return for these enormous expenditures. I can not believe that it is possible for us to continue this kind of legislation by omnibus bills much further.

Under the five-minute rule I will discuss a few proposed amendments. I do not care to take advantage of the time now, although I want to question some matters and discuss different items; but I do not intend now to discuss them further—the general provisions of this bill. I now offer to answer any questions so far as I am able.

Mr. HULBERT. I do not understand the gentleman to mean to say that he believes there are \$76,000,000 of new projects in this bill?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no. Forty-seven million dollars for new. I meant the old and new projects together.

Mr. HULBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he subscribes to a statement printed in the New York Sun that there are \$46,000,000 of new projects in this bill, two-thirds of which were worthless?

Mr. FREAR. I never made a statement of that kind, and I do not know.

Mr. HULBERT. I did not say that the gentleman made it, but does he subscribe to that statement in the New York Sun?

Mr. FREAR. I submit to the House that that is a very unfair question. What is the next question?

Mr. HULBERT. The gentlemen knows that more than one-third of the new projects are for the State of New York?

Mr. FREAR. I never formed any estimate in regard to that. What is the next question? It may be that some of the New York projects ought not to be put through at this time.

Mr. HULBERT. The gentleman has read the reports. Is he able to state any New York projects that ought not to be put through?

Mr. FREAR. I will say that the Army engineers refuse to say whether the New York projects need immediate improvement there or not. That is the one fault of the present system; they refuse to say, and appeal to us to read the reports and determine ourselves.

Mr. HULBERT. I am asking the gentleman what he thinks.

Mr. FREAR. It makes no difference what I think. Any further questions?

Mr. HULBERT. The gentleman does not care to answer my question.

Mr. FREAR. No; it is a needless question that can not be intelligently answered by Members with our slight knowledge of all the facts in each case.

Mr. HULBERT. Is it not a fact that the committee before the Christmas holidays made up a tentative list of the new projects to be included?

Mr. FREAR. No; they made up a list of old projects, but we never knew whether they were going to put new ones in or not, and some members of the committee voted against the new projects.

Mr. HULBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question; I perhaps was one of them, and I voted against the Oklawaha River. Was the gentleman present, and did he vote against taking on that project?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, yes; I was opposed to it before the gentleman was ever a Member of Congress. The Kissimmee, too.

Mr. HULBERT. Did the gentleman vote against it in committee?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I submit that the gentleman ought to observe the rules, and it is not proper to ask a Member on the floor how he voted in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the gentleman in his minority report on the Missouri River project says that the cost was \$23,000,000 and that it will cost \$35,000,000 to complete it.

Mr. FREAR. The present project?

Mr. BORLAND. That is what I want to know. I think it is only \$14,000,000 for the new project. The engineers' report shows that the present project would cost \$4,400,000.

Mr. FREAR. More than that. The gentleman must not take up too much of my time.

Mr. BORLAND. Why does the gentleman state it \$23,000,000?

Mr. FREAR. Because it has cost that amount thus far for the development of 19,370 tons of commerce in 1914.

Mr. BORLAND. No; \$4,000,000 has been spent.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, that means nothing under the particular project. You dredge a stream down to 5 feet in one year and the next time under some other project you dredge it down to 6 feet. That is a new project. It is the same stream, but you are deepening the channel and it is a new project. We have spent \$23,000,000 on it. Is there any other question the gentleman wishes to ask?

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. I see the gentleman recommends that the bill be cut to \$15,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. Is that because he thinks if \$15,000,000 be appropriated it would be used on all good projects, or because he thinks it is better to waste \$15,000,000 than to waste \$76,000,000?

Mr. FREAR. The reason is this. The Army engineers distributed in 1914 in one lump-sum project \$20,000,000 and a second time, in 1915, \$30,000,000. There has never been a Member who has risen on the floor to say that those lump-sum distributions made by the Army engineers did not meet all of the exigencies or the imperative necessities of that time, and I believe \$15,000,000 if fairly distributed will do the same without any criticism as to the necessities of navigation.

Mr. FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. FREEMAN. In the substitute which the gentleman proposes to offer appropriating the lump sum of \$15,000,000 does the Board of Engineers have any power to devote any part of that sum to new projects?

Mr. FREAR. No; and, following out that suggestion, I would be very glad to have any Member on this floor present a new project for that purpose. It could be done about as intelligently as under the present system.

Mr. FREEMAN. A great many new projects may be better than old projects.

Mr. FREAR. I have referred to that. Some of the old projects, in my judgment, should be abandoned and some new projects ought to be added. There is no doubt about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, for the last two or three years I have been listening to and reading vigorous attacks on river and harbor bills, and now, inasmuch as I voted for the last of these in the belief that it was a good bill, I wish to direct the attention of the House to what two men prominent in the public life of the country said last July about that measure while it was before the President for him to sign or to veto. One of these two prominent men, the Secretary of War, the other Brig. Gen. Black, Chief of Engineers. Now, presumably the President of the United States was very much interested at that particular time, the middle of the presidential campaign, in signing only such measures as thorough consideration should show ought to be signed. This particular bill had been bitterly attacked not only upon this floor, but also generally throughout the country. The President, as gentlemen will remember, waited 10 days after the bill had been presented to him before he gave it his approval and made it a law. Meanwhile he had asked the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers to prepare and submit to him their opinions as to the merits of the bill, these opinions to be based upon a thorough investigation of each of its provisions. The Chief of Engineers was an honor man at West Point. He now bears, as I said, the rank of brigadier general in the United States Army.

Here is the letter of the Secretary of War giving his opinion of that bill, which had been so savagely denounced upon this floor and elsewhere. I invite careful attention to what the Secretary told the President:

JULY 24, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I return to you herewith the river and harbor bill, which I have gone over with great care and upon which I hand you a report made by the Chief of Engineers with certain attached memoranda. The net result of this examination is to show that in this bill, carrying \$42,886,085, \$611,200, or about 1½ per cent, is, in the judgment of the Engineer Department of the War Department, regarded as economically indefensible, although in the case of some of these expenditures the improvements are probably not primarily for navigation purposes.

I concur in the view expressed by Gen. Black that the direct loss to the United States as a result of suspension of work, were this bill not to receive your approval, would be greater than the amount appropriated for improvements of a doubtful value; that is to say, upon all the great river and harbor projects of the country, if work were suspended, there would be loss due to the breaking up of existing organizations, the care of idle plants, etc., which would be very serious. Should this bill receive your approval, the department would have so much work on its hands that it would probably be obliged to delay some portion of it, and, of course, in selecting that to be delayed, the work of doubtful economic importance would be postponed, so that the entire \$611,200 marked as questionable would probably not be expended in any event.

Respectfully submitted.

NEWTON D. BAKER.

And here is also the special report, dated July 24, 1916, of the Chief of Engineers, made after a thorough examination of each item in that bill:

JULY 24, 1916.

From: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

To: The Secretary of War.

Subject: Report on pending river and harbor bill.

1. In compliance with your verbal instructions, the following report on the pending river and harbor bill is submitted:

2. For the past 8 or 10 years Congress has, in general, followed the policy of adopting no new projects except such as were favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers. The recommendations of the Chief of Engineers are in each case based upon a careful examination and survey to determine the nature and cost of the improvement to be undertaken and a full study of the probable benefits to be derived. The study is such as would be made by a careful business firm to determine whether it would undertake a new business venture.

The study is made by the district engineer and reviewed by the division engineer and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors before being acted on by the Chief of Engineers.

Who in all the United States, as Senator Burton once said when he was a Member of this House and chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, can constitute a more disinterested and intelligent board than is the Board of Engineers of the United States Army, a board wholly outside of business and of political life? Gen. Black said further:

3. Prior to the time mentioned above Congress adopted many projects which had not been subjected to such a careful study and which were not recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

The time there referred to, when projects not approved by the Chief of Engineers were adopted by Congress, was 8 or 10 years ago. He then proceeds:

As a rule it is certain of these projects which have been subject to recent attacks. To determine whether the attacks were justified, a

proviso was inserted in the river and harbor act approved March 4, 1915, directing a reexamination of all existing river and harbor improvements to determine which, if any, of them should be modified or abandoned. The results to date of this reexamination are set forth in brief in memorandum No. 1 herewith. Owing to lack of time the reports on these recommendations could not, with few exceptions, be made available for the consideration of Congress in connection with the pending river and harbor bill.

4. An examination of the bill shows that it contains certain items which were not included in the annual estimates of the Engineer Department, or which were included for a less amount than the bill provides. Memorandum No. 2, inclosed, cites these items in detail, and shows that, without exception, the added items and the increased amounts were introduced into the bill on recommendation of the Chief of Engineers based upon facts that came to light after the annual estimates had been submitted. There are also many items for which a less amount is provided than called for by the annual estimates. No discussion of them is deemed necessary.

5. Memorandum No. 3, inclosed, gives a list of all the items in the bill which may be classed as of doubtful value to the interests of navigation when subjected to the tests usually applied by the department. A final analysis shows that, of the total, \$42,886,085, carried by the bill, \$611,200 (about 1½ per cent) is not economically defensible in the judgment of the Engineer Department for navigable purposes, however meritorious it may be for other purposes.

6. To conclude, the items in the bill which can be justly condemned are few and the amount provided for them is small, as compared to the loss to the commercial interests of the country that would result from the failure to enact a river and harbor bill. Moreover, the direct loss to the United States as a result of suspension of work and care of idle plant pertaining to improvements of unquestioned merit would, as shown by the experience of 1914, in less than three months amount to more than is provided for the doubtful items.

7. It is recommended, therefore, that the bill be approved by the President.

W. M. BLACK,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

And yet the whole country had been led to believe that that bill of a year ago, for which many of us voted, was a thoroughly bad bill, whereas the truth, now clearly revealed, is that we then voted for a bill which it was wise to enact into law, a bill which a subsequent complete, impartial investigation of all of the facts showed was plainly in the public interest. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I consider that the present river and harbor bill before the House has more to commend and less to condemn in it than any bill during the past four years. I have been one of those more or less critical of numerous items in the river and harbor bills, but I think that the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] and the quotations that he has read from the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, apply more nearly to the bill before us to-day than they did to the one in regard to which he was making that comment. I am very glad to see included in this bill large and generous but fair appropriations for the great harbors of the country. [Applause.]

The items which I have previously criticized in river and harbor bills have been those just such as the gentleman from Wisconsin referred to, namely, the comparatively smaller items, but, nevertheless, the ones which have brought upon this House and the Congress the comment and criticisms which have been so generously bestowed during the last few years. We all recognize, Mr. Chairman, that it is very much easier to criticize than it is to praise, much easier to pull down than to build up, much easier, perhaps, unconsciously to get into a critical spirit carrying with it sometimes lack of absolute facts. It is perhaps to a certain extent within that line that a good deal of the existing comment and criticism on river and harbor legislation is based.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. On pages 28, 29, and 30 of the report is a proposed bill introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. Has the Committee on Rivers and Harbors ever given much consideration or any to that bill?

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, so far as I know, the gentleman who introduced that bill has never asked the committee for a hearing upon it. It would seem to me, as a member of the committee, if I were personally interested in legislation I would at least ask my own committee to give me a hearing on a bill I had introduced, but I may be in error in making that statement.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. FREAR. I am not questioning the gentleman's assertion, but with the impossibility of getting favorable action on the bill from the committee I thought it was absolutely useless. It was a tentative bill used for a constructive measure.

Mr. KELLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts just one further question, and that is, Whether he has given much consideration to the underlying principles of

this bill introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], and whether he thinks, if the plan of that gentleman were adopted, it would be better than the plan we are proceeding under now?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will say in reply to the gentleman from Michigan that I read the bill several times, but realizing it was not to come before us, and the gentleman who introduced it himself said he did not want to bring it before us, I have not given it the serious consideration I should have done had it been actually before the committee for action. I might say, however, in this connection, that I neither approve the principles on which the bill is based nor do I approve of carrying in this bill the so-called commission proposition. It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that a correction of some of the evils such as have been discussed on this floor lies right here on this floor. They start here, and they start here from the fact that the committee at times puts in projects many of us do not approve of, and then the House itself declines to strike them out. Now, if we are the cause of this trouble, we have the cure right in our own hands. My criticism of the suggestion, not in the suggested bill of the gentleman from Wisconsin but of the so-called commission that appears in the present river and harbor bill, is that you are going around in a circle. You are not accomplishing a single thing in the enacting into law of the so-called commission. You are going further. You are giving to men who are supposed to be experts in river and harbor matters the authority to study kindred propositions, in a large measure, as I see it, not germane to the subject of river and harbor legislation at all, and you are expecting as broad a commission as that, with the power and authority that this bill gives them, to be able to report to Congress next December. The proposition is absurd, as I see it, on the face of it.

I was speaking, Mr. Chairman, about some of our big harbors. I am very glad indeed to indorse all these harbor projects, starting with Boston and continuing on down the coast—New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Savannah, Charleston, Jacksonville, Tampa, and so on—around to the Gulf and on to the Pacific coast. I think every Member of this House can conscientiously vote for every project carried in this bill for the improvement of the harbors and centers of our commerce. Being from Massachusetts, although I represent no part of the Boston district, I naturally am particularly gratified that the committee has continued as one of the new projects carried in this bill the extension of the depth in Boston Harbor to 40 feet.

There is no place where the Government money will be better expended than in that great harbor, second in importance to New York only of all the harbors of this country, and fifth in international importance. There is every reason why Boston should be favored with the best of commercial opportunities. The State of Massachusetts is now expending, as this House I think well knows, the enormous sum of \$3,000,000 in constructing the largest dry dock on the Atlantic coast. If I am not misinformed within a few weeks the State officials having that work in charge have been in this city and have accepted the suggestion from the Secretary of the Navy that an annual rental should be paid to the State by the Government in order to secure the rights to the use of that dock for our largest battleships. We have there the great Charlestown Navy Yard. We have the great commercial development of the shipbuilding plants. The imports and exports are enormous, some figures I shall ask permission to insert in my remarks in the RECORD. So much for the general commendation of the present bill. Anyone can pick flaws in it. During my brief experience in Congress there has been very little legislation in which some of us sometimes can not pick flaws, and this is one of them. There are numerous projects in the present bill that I personally do not approve, but I have every respect for the judgment of the men who do approve them. I voted on this floor and voted in the committee for some of the inland water projects, but the more I consider that subject the less these projects appeal to me. If there is one meritorious it is the Delaware and Chesapeake, but then the question comes up whether Congress should be called upon to pay out \$1,300,000 for the purchase of what is pretty near, not absolutely but practically, an abandoned canal simply to secure the right of way.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I realize the gentleman wants to interrupt me so as to speak of the commerce.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think as the gentleman is fair in his other statements he ought to be fair in this one. This is not an abandoned property; it is a going property.

Mr. TREADWAY. I said that, and I will say to the gentleman if he had heard all the statement I made I do not claim that it is an abandoned project.

But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, the moment the Government pays \$1,300,000 for that project, that is an instance of

where the purchaser is naming the price. No one—our committee and no Member of this House and no Government official—has ever been able to present to Congress what the owners of that property would sell for. Up in New England, where we trade back and forth among each other, once in a while trade a horse or a cow or some of the farm products, the man that has the product to sell is the man that makes the first price. It may be an up price, but, nevertheless, it is something to start on. But here we have absolutely nothing to start on from anybody who has any ownership or control over that canal, other than for State officials to be quoted as saying that probably the State ownership, which is not worth a dollar, will be contributed to the Government. That is as near as I—a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors—personally have ever gotten any information as to the value of that property.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it possible that in Yankee-land, from which the gentleman comes, it is possible to get the dead to fix a price upon their property?

Mr. TREADWAY. Get the dead? Well, if it is as dead as all that, I do not think Uncle Sam ought to pay \$1,300,000 for it. I think I am nearer right than I thought I was when I said it was a dead issue.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is a value there. The people who have owned the property have passed away, and condemnation would settle the whole proceeding. The gentleman should put in his speech a fair statement of the situation.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not a fact that some official presented a letter to our committee in which it was said they owned the canal, but that the bonds were distributed wide cast and the stock was held wider cast, and consequently no one was in a position to name a price? I would like very much if the gentleman would insert the letter to which I refer, as I think it will corroborate what I am stating.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no objection to doing that, because it confirms what I said, that the ownership of the property is distributed among the States, and has been handed down from those who have passed away, so that the only method is to proceed by condemnation to take the property.

Mr. TREADWAY. That will inform the country that it is not worth anything or these heirs would have been glad to put a price on it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is where I differ with the gentleman.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then they trade differently in the Quaker State than we do in the Bay State.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They trade fair in the Quaker State.

Mr. TREADWAY. If I made any statement about the Delaware Canal other than it was a meritorious proposition, I would be entitled to criticism.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman in his enthusiasm a while ago made a statement saying that Boston was the second greatest port in the United States, and he ought to know that Philadelphia has long since exceeded Boston.

Mr. TREADWAY. It must have been since the year 1915, because the statistics prove that Boston was the second port of importance for the commerce of the year 1915. Possibly Philadelphia—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman wants the statistics in the Record, I will be glad to put them there, to show that Philadelphia is the second port in the United States.

Mr. TREADWAY. Nevertheless, I will claim, in spite of the intrusion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and his evident acceptance of the fact that his property is not worth very much, that from a commercial standpoint the intercoastal waterway in which he is so deeply interested is the best of the lot, so far as I know, and I am not praising it very much when I say that. [Laughter.] I do not honestly think a right of way through there is worth \$1,300,000 as a starter. That is just the beginning.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I regret to say, if the gentleman will permit me, that the gentleman has never passed through that territory, and we have been unable to prove to him personally that what he states is an inaccurate observation of the situation.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will put my statement up against that of the gentleman in the judgment of the membership of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We will be very glad to let it go at that.

Mr. TREADWAY. Now, the gentleman will get the funds, because the scheme is in the bill, and I am going to vote for it, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is a concession.

Mr. TREADWAY. Not very much of a one. I would always rather be with the gentleman than against him, because usually his judgment is very good.

Now let me call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to one feature wherein it differs from some of the others. This is a new project, and the appropriation is to start the indefinite expenditure for deepening the canal for through commerce and all that sort of thing. To-day the claim is made that it is desirable as a secondary line of defense. Well, with the amount of water that is passing through there you would not want to sink a very large submarine in it and expect it would get covered up, because it would not be. It would be sticking in the mud. Such a claim as that is absurd on the face of it. But as to the other inland waterways, I will say that I am sorry to be obliged to differ with my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] in his opinion of the merits of the one so dear to his heart. That is an adopted project in which we have put, I think, something over \$2,000,000. It is 25 per cent completed, and therefore it will take something like \$6,000,000 more to complete. It is not worth it in dollars and cents to the United States Government. That is my criticism of the whole line of inland waterways, unless the Treasury of the United States is overflowing with surplus and you want to find some way to spend your money.

There is another large project taken on in the bill before us, which means the expenditure of a large amount of money before its completion. I refer to the adoption of a lock and dam system on the Cumberland River. It, too, in a general way is an excellent project, but not to my mind at the present time, so far as our finances are concerned. It has not yet been demonstrated that the Government is getting due return for any of these enormous expenditures on lock and dam systems. Of course the best one in the country that has been adopted is that on the Ohio River, not yet completed. It will be some years yet before it will be completed, and until it is demonstrated on the Ohio River that such projects mean a good return on the investment of the Government I say let us go slow in taking on any more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I have one minute more?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. TREADWAY. There are several other things I should like to speak of, Mr. Chairman, but I realize that it is impossible now to go into them fully. I want simply to say this, that no man in Congress regrets the departure from it in the next Congress of the distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. SPARKMAN] more than I do, one of the newcomers to Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak for this bill, with special reference to the appropriation for the Mississippi River, and to advocate the necessity for its continued improvement, to the end that it will shortly become one of the greatest avenues of commerce in the United States. The city of St. Louis is located upon its banks. Recently the people of that city completed and dedicated a great municipal free bridge. That city is now constructing a modern municipal dock for the loading and the unloading of boats and barges. With its completion and the addition of other city docks and terminals, which are sure to follow, there will be a great change in the amount and kind of traffic upon this river. At the present time only about 150,000 tons are transported upon the river and nearly 55,000,000 by rail. The great development of river transportation will come about effectively and quickly, regardless of the other demands for deeper waterways. We are going to take advantage at once of the means at hand.

We are beginning the transportation, soon to be greatly increased, of our freight from St. Louis to New Orleans by barge liners, and at New Orleans they will be loaded upon ocean-going vessels which will carry same to South America and the Far East. Monopolies of Atlantic and Pacific coast cities of the trade in China and the Far East will soon be a thing of the past. St. Louis, the greatest manufacturing city of the Middle West, is fast becoming an important factor in this trade, and with the use to which we will soon put the Mississippi River for transportation of our traffic, our city will increase in im-

portance. Its population will soon be doubled. Its financial and industrial conditions, now unexcelled by any city of its size, will have a stupendous development. We of that city and of the great Middle West are fully awake to the importance and needs of improving this great river by keeping open a channel sufficient for the purposes indicated, as well as to protect the present levees and build new ones, so that the overflows and floods may become a thing of the past. This all will indirectly reclaim vast quantities of rich land, now known as swamp lands, for cultivation. In my judgment the most important phase of this whole matter lies in the opportunity it gives to us of the Mississippi Valley and of the Middle West to participate in the great development of trade with China.

What about China and our opportunities for trade there? What about St. Louis and its ability to participate in this trade by making use of the Mississippi River as I heretofore indicated? First, something about St. Louis.

It is recognized now as one of the greatest manufacturing centers in the United States. In speaking of St. Louis I include East St. Louis now as a part of our industrial city, since the two cities have been connected by a great free bridge. With the new conditions that will come about St. Louis will be one of the greatest steel-manufacturing centers in the country. It is now the greatest open-hearth steel-casting center of the country, if not of the world.

As an evidence of this, let me call your attention to some of the principal plants of this industry, which include the Commonwealth Steel Co., at Granite City, Ill., with annual consumption capacity of 40,000 tons; the Scullin Steel Co., within St. Louis's city limits, also able to use 40,000 tons annually; the two plants on the east side of the river of the American Steel Foundries Co., taking in each year another 80,000 tons; the National Enameling & Stamping Co., with an annual consumption at its Granite City plant of 20,000 tons; and the Alton plant of the Laclede Steel Co., requiring still another 10,000 tons each year to run to capacity. Then we are manufacturing pig iron into finished products, two large plants being devoted to these purposes, to wit: The Missouri Malleable Iron Co., with an annual consumption of 20,000 tons of malleable iron; the St. Louis Malleable Casting Co., with an annual requirement of 10,000 tons; the St. Louis Car Wheel Co., affiliated with the Southern Wheel Co., 10,000 tons; and the American Car & Foundry plants. St. Louis is fortunate in having all the coal, coke, and electric power needed to facilitate this and like industries. As to terminal facilities, no city has St. Louis surpassed in that respect. Why should not our city participate in the great increasing trade in China? Our city is capable in every respect. It is a city with more than 1,000,000 people within its industrial district. Forty million live within a radius of 500 miles. It is the largest inland city in the United States and fourth in manufacturing. It has now over 3,200 factories, and its products average over \$500,000,000 a year. The city has 19 miles of river front, and the greatest opportunity in the world is at our door for river transportation. St. Louis manufactures many things that are needed in China. We excel in many of these products in quantity and in quality of any place in the United States. We can send our products by water to China and bring back in the ships things that we can use here in our factories and mills. Now, as to China and our opportunities there.

The war in Europe must and will end shortly. Practically all of our exports at present are going to the European countries engaged in the war. This will not be the condition when the war ends. An economic alliance of European powers will be put into effect as soon as the war is over. The United States will not be in this. This virtually means that there will be no opportunity for our manufacturers to find markets in Europe for their products. We must look elsewhere, and the question is, Where will we find it? If we do not find new markets, our business will decline and our gold reserve will dwindle away. We all know that our phenomenal prosperity at this time, as well as the fact that we have such a great gold reserve, is due to the war. It will not take long after the war is over before adjustment, alliance, and so forth, in Europe will seriously affect us. Therefore we must put ourselves to work in order to find the new markets and bring about the necessary conditions that will enable us to take advantage of them. The Government of the United States must, and I believe will, do its part. One of the things it must do is to enact a law such as the Webb Act, which recently passed the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate. This would permit the utilization and cooperation of our manufacturers to cope with the combinations of foreign rivals, who are united to resist American competition. In other words, this would repeal those portions of our anti-trust law that forbid combinations, with special reference to

foreign commerce. We should permit Americans to cooperate in the development of our foreign trade. Congress must grant this authority. Then our Government must take a more active hand in helping American trade by providing more in the way of buildings and officials in foreign countries to assist in this development. I speak now specially with reference to China.

With fair and just laws by the Congress of the United States, with the resumption of traffic on the Mississippi River, and with the proper spirit on behalf of the men of means and ability of our city to handle this great question there can be no doubt but what St. Louis will reap a rich harvest of trade with China. It will make St. Louis greater than ever as a manufacturing center. It will bring to our city many new enterprises and increase our products. It will give employment to hundreds of thousands of people in our city—and, I might add, there is no better place to encourage people to come to live than St. Louis. Its climate, parks, schools, churches, and so forth, are as fine as can be found anywhere. We must bring together in St. Louis and its adjacent territory the manufacturing, agricultural, natural production, and the transportation and banking elements, who are and can be made interested in the American foreign trade. We must then obtain the necessary accurate and detailed information of the changed conditions that are taking place in the world markets. We must continue to have foreign trade. It now amounts to billions of dollars. We must not lose all with the close of the war. We must find new fields, and the greatest field is China. Then there must be ships for the transportation of our products on the Pacific. I have reason to believe that as the commerce increases ships and facilities will also increase. This has always been the rule, and it will be so now.

The American people should not hesitate to do their full duty in meeting the situation, for it was only a short while ago that we were bordering upon an industrial panic. Workingmen were unemployed, and there was scarcely any business. Then the war came. Our markets were drawn upon for the armies of Europe. Our factories, mills, mines, and farms began straining their utmost to supply the demands there because of high prices obtainable. This we have been doing ever since. Our foreign trade reached \$6,000,000 for the year ending July 1, 1916. We are so engrossed with stupendous foreign trade that has come to us from Europe as a result of the war that we are not giving enough attention to the hereafter. I hope, therefore, that the men of America will proceed in actually planning for the trade in China.

China is friendly to the United States. It wants to do business with us. We have always shown our friendliness for that country. We returned the Boxer indemnity. The Chinese Government set apart that fund, after we returned it, and now uses the income from it to educate Chinese boys in the universities and colleges of the United States. This enables many young Chinamen every year to take back to their country with their diplomas from our American universities the American ideas of business, and so forth. China is a country of great wealth. It has a population of nearly 450,000,000 people and an area of 4,300,000 square miles. There is not any doubt but that it is the greatest market in the world. Wonderful development is going on in China. The great Hankow-Szechuan Railway will soon be completed and will reach a population of 78,000,000 of skillful, hard-working, and peaceable people. This number of people is only a portion of the total Chinese, but it is larger than the population of any other country except the United States, Russia, and India. China needs more railroads. It should have at least 350,000 miles of railroads. It now has only 6,000.

China can be made a great market for the boot and shoe industry of St. Louis and other cities in the United States. There are 400,000,000 pairs of feet in China, and they are beginning to wear American shoes. The proper cultivation of this trade will bring to the United States enormous business in this line alone. China has a great hide industry. We could take to China our shoes and bring back their leather. We produce many other things that China uses now and will use in great abundance, such as hats, caps, shirts, clothing, gloves, neckwear, underwear, chemicals, jewelry, hardware, millinery, surgical instruments, railroad supplies of all kinds, and so forth. China is importing to-day over 200,000 pairs of shoes annually.

The people in the northern part of China are discarding their native shoes and are adopting leather shoes. The United States has but little of this trade at the present time. It will not have any of the great increase that will come within the next few years unless it enters heartily into the importance of the situation. They are erecting many splendid buildings in China to-day. Building supplies of all kinds are needed, as well as elevators and hoisting machinery. Last year two merchants came from Hongkong to the United States to buy \$1,000,000 worth of

tools and hardware. Our manufacturers were so engrossed in making munitions for the armies in Europe that these merchants had great difficulty in getting their order filled. There is a great demand in China for bicycles, steel plates, copper, brass, sheets, needles, braid, soaps, washbasins, enamel ware, small metals of inferior quality and price, and chemical products of all kinds. Practically all of these things we make in abundance through modern and up-to-date machinery, with the most efficient skilled labor in the world. Most of these things we make in St. Louis. Why not increase our trade a hundredfold by going to China? China has things that we want and need, and we ought to encourage its importation. They can sell us tea, camphor, hemp, cordage, lacquer ware, and so forth. China is a wonderful country, and is waiting anxiously and with outstretched arms for American business. American manufacturers, bankers, and engineers must do their part, unless they wish to see this country lose its share of the trade with China. We can not hesitate nor delay our duty in this respect much longer. China's great industrial future and history is being rapidly made. It will only be a short time until its sluice gates of wealth are fully opened up. If we are not on the ground then, our chance is gone. There are great opportunities for the bankers in the United States to help China to develop her wonderful resources as well as to finance American manufacturers who wish to take their goods to China to sell. It will be very remunerative to the bankers who do this. Chinese are people that believe in fair dealing. They want what they ask for and are willing to pay the price. Very few bankers have ever lost any money through the Chinese. Bankers ought to encourage foreign trade. It is to their interest. They should give their assistance and help in this direction.

Our opportunities for trade with China are better than those of any other country, because of the fact that the Chinese people are specially friendly to the United States for the reasons that I have stated, as well as for the fact that it was the United States that brought about the "open-door" policy with respect to that country, and which—I am advised by Hon. Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, under date of January 9 last, in answer to an inquiry from me as to what the conditions are at the present time relative to citizens of the United States trading with China—still continues. He says:

In reply I have to state that American citizens enjoy in China by treaty the same commercial privileges that are accorded to persons of other nationalities.

It was Secretary of State Hay who insisted upon the maintenance of the "open-door" policy. Efforts have been made to supersede this policy to the disadvantage of the United States, but the American people will not look with favor upon the action of any country that seeks to deprive us of our rights under that fair and just policy. China is particularly pleased and benefited by the fact that the United States has championed and been responsible for the "open-door" policy. It has saved the Chinese Empire.

The United States has for a long time been doing some business with China. It reached its highest point in exports in 1905. This was due to a large increase in the importation of American cotton goods. Our poor showing in our trade with China is due entirely to the fact that we have not tried to obtain it. With all the advantage on our side we are letting Germany, England, Japan, and other countries make inroads upon the commerce of China. If we put it off too long we will not be able to get in. It is true that America has made some good starts. The Singer Sewing Machine Co. has gone about introducing its products in a businesslike and successful way. This is so as to the Standard Oil Co. and the American Tobacco Co. Some typewriter companies, the General Electric Co., and some automobile manufacturers are making successful entries into the trade with China.

The United States has helped to make history for China. Let us continue to do so. The history of the world is that of trade development. We spend much money in sending missionaries to China, but honorable trade relations with these people will no doubt do as much for their good as will that of the missionary or educator. Trade and civilization have always kept step. This was so as to Egypt, Assyria, Rome, Greece, Babylonia, and Carthage. It has followed the victorious armies and crossed the Atlantic with Columbus. It will go with American commerce and trade to China, and there we will find the greatest opportunities for both. That the Chinese people have appreciated the Christian teachings of the American Nation there is no doubt. She needs it greatly to-day in many sections of that vast people. China also needs us to help open her wonderful resources. She has vast mineral deposits that have hardly been touched. In one Province it is said that they have enough coal to supply the world for a thousand years. Altogether it is said that coal exists in at least 15 Provinces in China. At present 10,000,000

tons of coal is being taken out of the mines annually. Iron, pig iron, and precious metals are to be found there. Thousands of tons of raw jute and sisal are produced there and exported to foreign countries. Millions of tin cans are made in China annually by hand. Up-to-date machinery is needed for this and like industries. A Chinese workman can turn out about 25 tin cans a day. One of our modern automatic machines will enable one man to turn out forty to fifty thousand similar cans in a day. One of the things needed in China most of all is up-to-date machinery.

American manufacturers who have engaged in business in China are making money. A rope factory there has had its stock to increase from \$100 to \$312 and has paid 25 per cent dividends on the original investment. A tobacco company is paying 45 per cent, a sugar company 15 per cent, a paper and pulp and mill company 10 per cent, a flour mill company 10 per cent, a cement manufacturing company 22 per cent, etc. China is a wonderful land. The whole world is watching it. It is the wide-awake people that will help to bring tremendously to the forefront this country. Those who aid will reap a large harvest financially, and at the same time help the Chinese people themselves. The people of the United States have always been equal to every responsibility. Will it meet this, the greatest opportunity of modern civilization, or will they leave it to people of other nations? The United States Government is doing its part. It must continue to do so and help the American manufacturers and American bankers to enter into the trade with China on as favorable terms as the Governments of England, Germany, and other countries grant to their people. What has the United States done? We built the Panama Canal to help to get to the markets of China. We took over the Hawaiian Islands as a further help. We have the Philippine Islands, which is an additional assistance in this respect. Between Hawaii and the Philippines we have Guam. We are working now to put upon the Pacific ample ships. We are appropriating money for the rivers and for the harbors, so that the commerce of the inland States and cities, like our own, can have water transportation.

If we do not take advantage of all these things it is our own fault and our own loss. In the city of Manila, the Philippine Islands, alone there is great opportunity for the manufacturers in the United States to carry permanent stocks of goods of all kinds, and which can be drawn upon from time to time to support the trade of China. This is an opportunity for American manufacturers, and gives them an advantage in the Chinese trade that can not be secured by any European country. No country of Europe has a base so near or a territory anywhere near as large that will enable it to carry a large supply of goods. The American business houses, therefore, should make arrangements to carry their stocks of goods to Manila and then have agencies in the various markets of China. American manufacturers could establish branch factories also in the Philippine Islands to manufacture goods for the Chinese trade. With all these superlative advantages and opportunities open to us we should not hesitate longer, but awaken to our responsibility and our chance to many times double our foreign export trade. Let the "Rich trade of the Orient" be ours. Let us not pass slightly the opportunity of the "golden future" in obtaining our share of "the great commerce of China's teeming millions shortly to be developed."

Some 50 years ago a distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. William H. Seward, made the following prophecy: "The Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands, and the vast region beyond will become the chief theater of events in the world's great hereafter." This prophecy has already been fulfilled. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DYER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall vote for the rivers and harbors appropriation bill, but I do not want my vote construed as an approval of the past and prevailing methods of spending the public money for rivers and harbors improvements. I believe that many of the

items in this bill are wasteful and extravagant, and I shall gladly support any just plan of reform in appropriating funds for our waterways.

But under the present system the only way to secure badly needed improvements is to pass a bill like this which is now pending. I do not believe that the projects deserving assistance from the Government should be made to suffer because of the sins of others.

There is included in this bill an appropriation of \$98,000 for maintenance and improvements of Ashtabula Harbor, located in the nineteenth Ohio congressional district, which I have the honor to represent. This harbor is one of the most important on the Great Lakes. Each year millions of tons of iron ore from the mines in the Lake Superior region come into this harbor and are distributed therefrom to the iron and steel industries of the Mahoning Valley and to other parts of eastern Ohio and western Pennsylvania. It is about 120 miles from Ashtabula to Pittsburgh, and throughout those 120 miles we have a teeming hive of industry. There the great iron and steel mills are located. There are thousands of men in the Pittsburgh and Youngstown districts employed in the iron and steel industries that are dependent to a great extent on the products that come through Ashtabula Harbor. There are also thousands of railroad men who look for their livelihood to the products that are shipped to and from that harbor.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I have only four minutes left. There are also millions of tons of coal shipped annually from this harbor to furnish heat and power to the great Northwest.

It is absolutely necessary for the economic development of this harbor that the improvements proposed in this measure should be made. The report of the United States engineers shows this conclusively. The money which it is proposed to spend will be used for dredging the harbor so that large lake vessels may continue to use it, and for extending a breakwater so that the washing of sand into the harbor may be checked. Under present conditions this washing of sand into the harbor requires continual dredging at a large expense to the Government, and it would be a measure of economy to provide for extending the breakwater.

In 1913 the tonnage of Ashtabula Harbor was 15,743,375, according to the report of the minority filed in opposition to this measure. There can be no question as to the importance of the harbor or the need of the improvements. Therefore, in justice to not only the thousands of people at Ashtabula and in the iron and steel industries of my district, who are directly affected by the condition of this harbor, but also to the millions of consumers of the products of the iron ore, and the coal which passes through the harbor, I can not do otherwise than vote for the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman yield back any time?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT] 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, it had not been my purpose to occupy any part of the time allotted for general debate, but would prefer to bring up the few items upon which I desire to be heard when the bill is read under the five-minute rule. A reference, however, in a New York City newspaper yesterday to the fact that of the total amount of new projects in this bill at least two-thirds are worthless, has prompted me to speak briefly at this time.

First of all, I desire to call attention to the fact that of the \$47,050,112 in new projects which this bill authorizes, \$18,370,000 cover items in the State of New York, of which all but three projects are in the port of New York, and that the total comprises approximately 40 per cent of the whole amount of the new projects carried in the bill. So that, according to the computation of the New York City newspaper which I have referred to, there must be included among the remaining two-thirds of worthless projects Boston Harbor, \$1,145,000; the Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, \$1,649,000; Baltimore \$876,000; Norfolk, \$840,000; Savannah Harbor, \$1,920,000; Tampa, \$1,425,000; Mobile, \$1,030,000; Honolulu, \$1,537,000; Lake Washington, \$657,000; Grays Harbor, Wash., \$700,000; Richmond Harbor, \$771,000; Los Angeles, Cal., \$626,000; Ashland, Wis., \$270,000; and Green Bay, Mich., \$110,000.

I do not believe that even my distinguished colleague on the committee [Mr. FREAR] will contend that any one of these projects may be classified as worthless, but rather I believe if it

were possible to press the question for a direct answer he would willingly concede that each and every one of them is meritorious and entitled to favorable consideration.

So that, added thereto, the Delaware & Chesapeake Canal, the total amount of new projects included in this bill, which I venture to predict not even the most strenuous foe of the passage of this river and harbor bill could question, we find a total of \$40,324,273, leaving approximately \$7,000,000 of which the greater part can be readily justified by anyone, and all of which have met with the approval of a majority of the committee.

It might very well be that if some members of the committee who have undertaken to criticize these items on the floor under the searchlight of publicity had attended regularly the meetings of the committee, and particularly while the subject of new projects was under consideration, and shown anything like the same spirit and exercised the right as a member of the committee to vote on these projects—and I say this mindful of the rule, which I was admonished to observe this morning, for I believe that I can make this statement without committing an infraction of that rule—that some of the items complained of would not be present to be objected to.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize, from the standpoint of the cities located upon great harbors, the importance of the passage of this bill. In the minority report submitted by my colleague he calls attention to the fact that the city which I have the honor in part to represent, with the great tonnage of 100,000,000 tons per annum, substantially 1 ton for each person in population in the United States, there was only \$40,000 appropriated for Ambrose Channel and \$210,000 for continuing the project for the improvement of the west side of the Hudson River at New York. And yet neither he or anyone else can successfully contend that the committee have not allowed every dollar the Army engineers asked for and can profitably expend during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. FREAR. I concede that; but the point I was trying to make was that it was a waste of money on other projects.

Mr. HULBERT. I am going to get to that waste. The difficulty with respect to the appropriation of money for great harbors like New York is that this Congress can not appropriate the amount of money to meet the commercial necessities of the occasion because men like the gentleman from Wisconsin have stood upon the floor and raised the cry of "pork," and made it impossible to pass through the Senate bills which contain new projects, and without the adoption of which it is not possible for this House to appropriate money absolutely needed in great ports upon the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULBERT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. If it were impossible for us to supply the needs, which I would support any time, is not that a suggestion and a good reason we should change our method of procedure?

Mr. HULBERT. I have advocated a change in the method, but I am dealing now with the method that is now in use under the rules of the House as adopted upon its organization. Take the East River, for instance, and no one doubts the necessity for improvement, and everyone appreciates its commercial importance. In 1914 the commerce transported on the East River had a value of \$1,500,000,000. In 1915 it was over \$4,000,000,000. Everybody realizes the importance of that improvement from the standpoint of naval preparedness in order to give vessels of the Navy ingress and egress to and from the navy yard from Long Island Sound, as well as the Sandy Hook route.

But there has not been, except in two special cases that were made, one at the last session of Congress and the other in the previous Congress, totaling a little less than \$1,000,000—there has been no appropriation made for the improvement of the East River in nearly five years, because the Army engineers recommended to Congress that the improvement which was being made under the project was adopted in 1868 for a 26-foot channel, and which was outgrown in 1888, was economically inadvisable. It is not possible to secure further appropriations for improvement of that great waterway until you pass a bill which contains the new project recommended by the Army engineers.

We have another item in New York that I want to call attention to because of its urgency, not to us any more than to the whole country. The city of New York has recently constructed, at a cost of about \$3,000,000, one of several piers, which they propose to build. It is located on the east side of the Hudson River, at Forty-fifth Street, in the Borough of Manhattan. The fact of the matter is that at that point in the river there is a bar which extends from Thirty-fourth Street to Fifty-seventh Street, over which a depth of 22 feet of water obtains. This pier and those projected are intended to serve the convenience of the largest trans-Atlantic liners now afloat or in the course

of construction. These vessels have a draft of from 38 to 40 feet, and you can realize the impossibility of utilizing that pier and others which we intend building when the depth of water at the approaches is only 22 feet. So I urge upon you that these and other projects of equal importance justify the passage of this bill, although I shall be glad to see and will vote to strike out any items which I opposed in the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman from Washington consume some of his time?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the Chairman kindly notify me when I have talked 10 minutes?

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it was not my intention to speak during general debate, but I think one of the challenges made by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] ought to be answered. He practically makes the challenge upon the floor of this House that the statements he made in his minority report are correct. There may be no single, direct statement that is not correct, but taken as a whole it is one of the most misleading documents, in my judgment, that was ever presented to this House. I think I will show the gentleman a place or two where his misleading statements have done far more damage in the country than if he had made a direct misstatement of fact. Attention has already been called to where he started out and said:

Nowhere will be found evidence of a wasteful method in Government affairs to be compared with the autocratic demands of the Army Engineers.

The Army engineers, as we know, have nothing whatever to do with it. If the gentleman was going to build a house and asked a contractor to figure on it and he came and presented what he thought to be a correct statement of what it would cost it would be just as much a "demand" on him as the Government engineers make in these cases. But I do not care so much about that; but there is one statement in this report that directly reflects upon the membership of that committee, and I feel that it ought to be publicly answered. I want to call the attention of the House and of the gentleman from Wisconsin to the statement he makes on page 10 of this report and then to show how far he is from the truth. He says:

After five legislative days' consideration of these new projects by the committee, together with the transaction of other important business, including hearings pertaining to old projects and new, and a proposed resolution, the pending bill was reported out of committee on January 11. This information is all a matter of public knowledge, although the method of selection and distribution of 60 new projects, aggregating \$47,050,112, appearing in the 1917 bill is improper to discuss or comment upon.

Now, what is the direct insinuation of that sentence? What would you think of a libertine who had been seen several times in company of a woman who should say, "It is not proper to discuss the character of women among gentlemen. They do not refer to those things. Therefore I will say nothing about her." Could anything be more damning to the reputation of the woman? Yet here is a member of this committee who says that \$47,000,000 were distributed in five days, but it is not proper to comment upon the methods used in the committee in the distributing of this money. I say an insinuation of that kind is unworthy of the gentleman from Wisconsin. We must admit that he is an honest man and that he is an intelligent man, and he must understand the meaning of the English language—

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman permit—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And when he spreads broadcast a statement of that kind to the newspapers of this country it is only fair to assume that he puts upon it the construction that the man of ordinary intelligence places upon it.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. FREAR. I did not intend that, and I do not believe it has ever been taken in that way by anyone else.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh!

Mr. FREAR. Just a moment. Because the fact had been announced in the papers, and by the chairman of the committee, that they were going to take over new projects. That is all; and I have no right to comment on anything that occurred in the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. When the gentleman made that statement he knew that he could not comment upon it, but by the insinuation he gave the impression that the members of that committee were distributing \$47,000,000 in a method that could not be commended. That is what he meant to say; that is the ordinary meaning of the language.

Now, if the gentleman will just wait a minute, I will show him something else that is just as bad, and I say in all seriousness that this whole report is unworthy of the gentleman from Wisconsin or of a Member of this House. He knows what language means.

Mr. FREAR. I could not possibly have commented upon it under the rule.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Of course you could not comment on it, but you could have kept still about it. You had no right to refer to it. That is where you do by insinuation what you dare not do openly.

Mr. FREAR. I dare do anything that is fair, and I will. The gentleman mistakes my disposition.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. This report has all the characteristics of some editor of some yellow newspaper or magazine who dares not make a statement, but wants to insinuate as much as he can, hoping thereby to escape a libel suit. Now, wait a minute and I will give you a little more of what he said. He says it is a matter of public knowledge that the committee distributed 60 new projects in five days, and he says further:

It is submitted that the insertion of new projects in this manner does not permit further comment in this report, although a brief consideration of value, or lack of value, ought to be placed before the House when the bill is under discussion.

What is the truth in regard to that? He wants the House and the country to believe that this committee placed 60 new projects in that bill in five days without giving them due consideration. Is not that what his language means? If that is not what language means, then I do not know the meaning of English words.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; not just now. Now, that is the statement he made. That is what he sends out to the newspapers. That is what he sends out to get his publicity and his headlines. Now, what is the truth about it? He said there were 60 new projects. There were 81. That is about as close as he usually comes, and I commend him for getting that near to the fact in that one statement. Now, what is the fact? Of these 81 new projects 76 were included in the 1914 bill, if I am not mistaken. They had been before the committee before. They had been considered; we knew about them; they were not new projects except in a technical sense, because they had already been considered and been before the committee before; but he sends out to the people of the country and wants them to believe that the committee took those 81 new projects, or 60 as he says, and in five days, without consideration, sat around a table and by methods that he can not comment upon distributed this \$47,000,000.

If he had wanted to be fair about it, why did he not say that most of these projects had been considered by the committee before; that the committee was familiar with them; that some of them had been before the committee for years? If he wanted to be fair, why did he not continue and say that a good many of those projects, perhaps the majority of them, were in reality a mere continuation of old projects? I submit to the Members of this House that if the people of this country could come here and listen to some of these reformers and know the facts about the situation, these reformers would get about as much hearing throughout the country as they do here in this House.

Let us see whether it is such a reprehensible thing to take on new projects in five days. I shall take my own projects, because they are the ones with which I am most familiar, those of the northwest portion of this country. Each one of them has been before the committee for years; but suppose they were not, how long would it take an intelligent Member to decide in respect to any one of them? For instance, take, as an illustration, the new project on the Skagit River. The Skagit River is the largest river that flows into Puget Sound. Mount Vernon is at the head of navigation. The annual commerce upon that river is about \$4,000,000. Water competition directly reduces freight rates, because the railroad runs through the town, and on passenger rates it makes about a dollar a passenger between there and the city of Seattle. There is a bar between the mouth of the river and the head of navigation, Mount Vernon, and unless it is removed the whole navigation will be stopped, and the advantage of the freight rates will be lost. Four million dollars' worth of commerce will be destroyed or sent by rail. It will cost \$30,000 to do that. How many men in this House would have to take a day or half an hour to decide whether that is a new project that ought to be included in the bill?

Let us take the other one, one of the largest new projects in the bill. At Seattle for the purpose of a canal the Government has expended \$3,000,000. The local authorities have expended \$6,000,000 more. That great project is ready to use, but in order to use it you have to dredge between the lake and the deep water in Puget Sound, or else the whole property is of no value. How long would any intelligent Member of this House want to study that matter to determine whether or not it ought to be adopted?

Most of the new projects are of that class. There are a good many projects in this bill where there can be a fair difference of opinion, where people can honestly differ, but the majority of these are not the new projects; and I want to repeat that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] made an argument that was unworthy of him and unworthy of any Member of this House when in a report which he writes, and not in an utterance upon the floor of the House, he spreads the impression throughout the country that in its grab for pork the Members of the committee sat around the table and in five days distributed these projects in a method that he could not comment upon, and failed to state that most of them had been passed upon, and that there were only a few that were new to the committee, and that most of those were of such character that he himself, if he had attended the committee meetings and had attended to his business, would have decided ought to go on the bill. [Applause.]

I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not vote for this river and harbor bill, although that decision is entirely apart from the merits of the bill. I shall not vote for it because I think that we could do without an annual river and harbor bill in the present state of the Treasury. I shall take the time, however, to make a very slight statement, which I may not have time to complete, with reference to the formation of a river and harbor bill. There have been a great many suggestions made at different times. Whatever men may think about the merits of particular propositions in a bill, there is no legislation which comes before Congress which is so critically scanned by experts as are the river and harbor bills before they reach the House. In the first place, the War Department itself can not institute any recommendation upon its own motion. It is the only branch of the Government that is not permitted to do so. The Executive can not order the War Department to make a report or an estimate or a recommendation to Congress in reference to a river and harbor improvement. You can not reach the War Department through political influence exercised upon the President or the Secretary of War. A provision in the river and harbor bill begins with an item for a survey, and under the law the engineers can not make a survey until as experts they have made an examination as to the probable economy of the improvement, the use that will be made of it, and the benefit that it will be to the shipping industry and to the public.

The Board of Engineers of the United States Army are selected men from West Point, who hold their office for life, or for good behavior if they do their work. They are the least subject to political influence of any body in the United States by reason of their position. [Applause.] They can not go to the political activities which exist in the War Department with reference to promotions, because all of their promotions are automatic except as to the Chief of Engineers. When we determine by reason of the activity of a Member of Congress representing his constituents to ask that board to make an examination, they have to first determine whether it will be a profitable adventure if entered upon, and then they are permitted to make an estimate of the cost and present the project to the House. The House itself can not order them to do this. It could at one time by a resolution. The Senate itself can not order them to do this. It is the only case in the Government service where the House can not by resolution ask Government officers to render a service, or where the Senate can not by a resolution ask Government officers to render a service. After they make their estimate, made by the local engineer aided by a civilian engineer working under him, also permanently employed, they have to go through the form—in many cases it is a form, though in some cases it is the real thing—of having the report pass through the district engineer and the engineer of the enlarged district, whose title I do not now remember. Then the matter goes before the Board of Engineers. Then it comes before the Chief of Engineers. Then it comes before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. There are more processes involved, and far more expert men, wholly disinterested, unbiased, uncontrolled by politics, in reference to a river and harbor item than any other legislation provided by any legislative assembly in the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield three minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, the river and harbor bill comes to the House. We call it a pork-barrel bill. It is in the sense that term is used. It comes to the House as an omnibus bill, with the items bunched together. If we had a thousand hours in the day and a thousand days in the year and could sit here all the time, possibly, but not probably, we might con-

sider those items by themselves. It is never practicable to pass river and harbor items as separate bills, and with some experience in the House I venture to say that if the river and harbor items were introduced as separate bills by Members from their various districts, with those Members pulling and hauling, with the personal influence upon the committee, there would be more bad projects reported by that system than are reported now, because the committee then would say, "Oh, the items come up by themselves; the responsibility is not upon us, the responsibility is upon the House." It is an easy question to cite the Claims Committee of the House, a good committee, which has done excellent work, but which reports more bad bills through personal solicitation than all the other committees of the House combined, because they are separate bills. Pulling and hauling is what gets it. If we should make a lump-sum appropriation to the War Department, it would not benefit things at all, because half the scanning will be taken away. We do not provide for river and harbor bills until they have passed the War Department. Then they have to pass the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, they have to pass the House and Senate, though I do not know that that is very much under the circumstances, and the giving of a lump sum would only make it worse. But to let the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of War, and one other Secretary, as provided in this bill, select some chief clerk there or some high-priced clerk, wholly subject to political influence, wholly under the control of a superior officer, holding a tenure of office at the will of the man above him, without training, without expertness, for them to pass upon the methods now in existence of determining these things by the War Department, would be to ask an ignorant man to judge of the literary ability of a distinguished scholar. What is the use? [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LIEB].

Mr. LIEB. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the important appropriation bills which must initiate in the House of Representatives. It represents one of the most useful activities of the Federal Government. The improvement of harbors, of interior waterways, for the development of water-borne commerce, is certainly of sufficient importance to entitle it to the serious consideration of the Congress representing the country. I think it is fair to state that this river and harbor bill is no more subject to criticism than any of the other great appropriation bills which annually come before Congress. It is not perfect; of course, it is not; neither is any other of the appropriation bills perfect. It is inherent in a democracy to have many claims for Government activities upon the Federal Treasury; yet in the consideration of those claims, in a country as diversified as ours in climate, in soil, and in other necessary governmental needs, it is not to be wondered at that there will be disagreements upon the part of some as to the merit or demerit of some particular item in a river and harbor bill.

Now, I shall devote the brief time I have to some of the criticisms which have been made. Wise and honest and intelligent criticism is useful when applied to any legislation of a public character, and it is certainly useful on this bill. I think, for instance, the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], while I and others may not agree with him in its entirety, yet we can at least appreciate the honesty and zeal of his efforts, knowing the time that he has given to the consideration as a member of the committee in the formulation of this bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] stated that he thought we ought not to have a bill at this time, and he is entitled to his opinion; and as a respected and diligent and influential Member of this House, any expression from him will be given consideration. But I submit that the kind of criticism against this bill which emanated from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] is not worthy of him, is not worthy of the House, and is unfair toward his colleagues. He made the statement that at least one-half of this bill was waste, that the appropriations were for no useful purpose. That of course implies that his colleagues on the committee have either deliberately or ignorantly appropriated money for no useful purpose. Of course that is a very serious charge, but that is the only implication from such language. He is not in favor of

river and harbor legislation. He would not vote for this bill no matter what kind of a bill was reported. He did the committee the honor just a moment ago to say that he admits the projects for the great harbor of New York are good, but he does not know. Now, if he does not know whether those projects for the great harbor of New York are meritorious, I would like to know how far his knowledge extends as to other projects in the country, particularly those in the interior. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said that every statement in his minority report was correct, and he challenged the House or any Member of the House to point out any incorrect statement in that report.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SMALL. I do.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman misunderstood me. I said I challenged them to point out some mistake. I assume a mistake may be made either by the gentleman or myself, but I did not want to be misunderstood.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman challenged us just to point out a mistake.

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. SMALL. I will just point out a few. At the bottom of page 2 in his report it is stated that Ashland Harbor receives nothing in this bill. As a matter of fact, on page 29 of the bill there is an appropriation of \$10,000 for the purpose of completing a project which was estimated for in the report submitted in House Document No. 1698, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Not now. A project which was estimated to cost \$269,984. A total of \$634,500 has been heretofore appropriated for Ashland Harbor. When the gentleman stated that nothing had been appropriated he would have us infer, I presume, that Ashland Harbor had been neglected.

Mr. FREAR. I wish to correct the gentleman on that point. I was referring entirely to the whole project. I was giving the comparison.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman said there was no appropriation in the bill, as appears in his minority report, bottom of page 2.

Mr. FREAR. No.

Mr. SMALL. And as to Chicago Harbor, the gentleman has combined the commerce for Chicago Harbor and Chicago River, Calumet Harbor and the Calumet River, and states that Chicago receives only \$65,000 in the bill. These projects receive altogether \$103,170, of which \$38,170 is for widening the channel at the mouth of the Calumet River, and the balance is for maintenance. All projects are completed except that for the outer harbor at Chicago, and there is an available balance of \$899,723 for continuing this work, which the Chief of Engineers says is sufficient for all work contemplated prior to July 1, 1918. The only purpose of the reference to Chicago Harbor was to show that it had been neglected. Why did not the gentleman disclose these facts?

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield there? That was not the purpose at all.

Mr. SMALL. Then his language can have no purpose whatever. The gentleman says that Buffalo Harbor gets nothing in the bill. As a matter of fact, it appears from the report of the Chief of Engineers that there was a balance on hand June 30 last of \$237,306, with which it is intended to repair breakwaters and do maintenance work, and the Chief of Engineers says that is sufficient for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918. If the gentleman's purpose was to show that harbor had been neglected, why did he not say so?

Mr. FREAR. That was not my purpose and the gentleman knows it was not.

Mr. SMALL. What was the purpose?

Mr. FREAR. I wish to show that the amount of money, \$18,000,000, given other projects was not equalled—

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman may deceive himself but not honest men.

Mr. FREAR. I do not deceive myself.

Mr. SMALL. I decline to yield further. The gentleman says in his report that Cleveland Harbor only gets \$60,000. There was a balance of \$298,770 on hand on June 30 last, which with the \$60,000 allowed in this bill will do all the maintenance work and repair work for the next fiscal year. He says the Duluth-Superior Harbor is allowed only \$45,000. As a matter of fact, the bill carries \$69,000 for this harbor, and an estimate of \$180,000 will go in the sundry civil bill under a continuing contract heretofore authorized. Why did not the gentleman tell the truth?

Speaking of the Oklawaha River, he says it had only 1,760 tons of commerce in 1915. The statistics in the report of 1916, page 2302, include the following:

Oranges, crate material, grain and hay, naval stores, cypress logs, pine logs, and miscellaneous, making a total of 29,393 tons.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield? That is absolutely correct—

Mr. SMALL. Not unless the gentleman says my statement is incorrect.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman's statement is incorrect if he will take out the saw logs.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman made the statement in his report that there was only 1,760 tons of commerce.

Mr. FREAR. I know the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. SMALL. Another statement in the gentleman's report is on page 4, referring to the Brazos River. He states that it has received \$2,946,250 for a small commerce near the mouth of the river and carries \$66,000 for the old project, and \$150,000 more for another project, which, when adopted, will mean \$455,000.

As a matter of fact, the project adopted includes only 6½ miles above the mouth of the river, and is separate and distinct from the open channel and lock and dam project, extending 417½ miles above the mouth of the river, which presumably the gentleman referred to. Why did he not tell all the truth about it?

On page 4, as to the upper Cumberland, he says that in 1915 it only produced 37,000 tons of "commerce," excluding sand hauled 9 miles, and timber products. I have here a statement from the annual report of the Chief of Engineers, showing that in the calendar year 1915 there were on that river 266,639 tons of commerce. The total freight, exclusive of sand and gravel and rafted products, is given as 96,355 tons, valued at \$3,878,618. Why did the gentleman state it was 37,000 tons? Why did not the gentleman tell all the truth?

Mr. FREAR. Does the gentleman say these figures are not correct? I will put them in the Record, then, to show the duplication.

Mr. SMALL. I decline to yield.

In his minority report, on page 4, speaking of the Cumberland River, he says:

On this same river, the Cumberland below Nashville, the Government has further appropriated in past years \$3,184,267, in addition to \$632,000 more contained in the pending bill, to produce in 1915 just 16,374 tons of commerce, excluding timber products and sand and gravel.

What are the facts? I have before me here a table, which I clipped from the annual report of the Chief of Engineers, giving an itemized statement of the commerce of that section of the Cumberland River for the calendar year 1915, which shows a total commerce of 126,949 tons. The total commerce, exclusive of sand and gravel and rafted products, is given at 109,079 tons, and not 16,374 tons as given in the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. FREAR. But did not the gentleman deliberately misrepresent me there?

Mr. SMALL. I decline to yield. Why did not the gentleman tell all the truth?

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman misquoted me, that is all, and refuses to allow me to correct it.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman; I selected a few statements in the minority report of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I have shown by the official record that they are incorrect.

As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] well said, it will be difficult to find a report which is more disjointed, where facts are stated with less regard to reasoning sequence, which is more difficult to analyze, which has more glaring misstatements of facts, and which is unworthy of a report submitted to this House in opposition to a great appropriation bill than this minority report submitted by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Legitimate criticism, as gentlemen before have said, is invited. The House wishes it. The members of this committee wish it. But the kind of criticism which only seeks publicity, which goes outside of the House in order to disparage, to malign, and to slander the good name and the reputation of the colleagues of a Member upon the committee and his colleagues in this House is unworthy of a Member of the House. [Applause.]

Let us hope that such criticism as this, sooner or later, will be taken at its true worth. The gentleman will learn that not for the sake of mere publicity, not for the sake of disparaging the reputation of the membership of this House, of which he is one, can he oppose legislation in this House, whether it be alleged "pork-barrel" bills, or any other appropriation bills, or any other class of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, legitimate criticism of this bill at the hands of an industrious and intelligent Member might point out items which were worthy of the consideration of this body. I can not say whether or not the gentleman has been intelligent or diligent in the discharge of his duties as a member of the committee. That would be in violation of the rules. But I would challenge the gentleman—which I think would not be a viola-

tion of the rules—at some time during the consideration of this bill to get up and tell the House truthfully and frankly, if he can do so—and I assume that he can—exactly how he did discharge his duties as a member of this important committee.

Mr. FREAR. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. SMALL. And if he makes the statement frankly and truthfully, as I assume he will do, and his statement is corroborated by his colleagues on the committee, then he must take the chances of the correct inference as to the manner in which he has discharged his duties before the House and the country and as to whether he is entitled to credence in the press of the country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wills Strait, Casco Bay, Me.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1416, Sixty-second Congress, third session, \$16,500.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire during the reading of the bill at different points to strike out some of the items and also to read other items. I do not care particularly to speak of this item, but I want to say a word in response to what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] has said, the gentleman who has just spoken. It places me in the position of being compelled to make a statement of what took place in the committee. I have not that right, as the gentleman well knows. I would be very glad to give all my reasons to the gentleman, and I will say that from 8 or half past 8 o'clock in the morning until nearly 6 o'clock at night I have been working every day in my office on this bill and others as best I could.

The gentleman has quoted some figures in the minority report unfairly, for when I stated "timber products" and he said "rafted products" of course he must have known that he was not quoting me correctly. I say there may be errors in this report, but the gentleman has not pointed them out in any instance. I did not state that this report is accurate in every particular, but I do say the gentleman has not pointed out a single statement where an error has been made.

If the House permits, I shall be glad to state what happened in the committee. Have I that right, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that a Member has not that right.

Mr. FREAR. I assume so, and I do not want to be discourteous to the House in justification of my own course, Mr. Chairman. I was patient, and I endeavored to be consistent and fair and honest with every member of the committee. I think the chairman will concede that I attended many of the meetings of the committee, and that I wrote him frankly my position on this bill right from the start, right after the bill was made up. The chairman knows that. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], for whom I have a very high opinion—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me for an interruption?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose a gentleman has the right to ask a question. Was the gentleman from Wisconsin present at the meetings of the committee when the bill was made up?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, yes; at different meetings, as frequently as I found opportunity.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. Did the gentleman attend the meetings of the committee regularly after the 1st of January, when they were considering the new projects?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, have I the right to answer that?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can state whether he attended the meetings or not.

Mr. FREAR. I notified the chairman of the committee at that time that I was opposed to the bill, and that not one or two or three items could persuade me to vote for the bill, because my item was in. That is the situation I found myself in.

Mr. HULBERT. Does the gentleman believe that because he was opposed to the bill because he could not understand it before it was made up, that that discharged him from performing the duty of attending the meetings of the committee and keeping out items that he did not believe ought to be therein?

Mr. FREAR. The old projects had practically been agreed upon. There is no question about that. And when it came to the new projects, I was opposed to adding them to the bill. Others members who were opposed to them also refused to attend the meetings of the committee. There was nothing to be gained thereby. I could not change the result, so I began to prepare my report and for discussion of this and other bills which were expected to come up immediately for passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nantucket Harbor, Mass.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$45,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment under the last item will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not ask to strike out many of the items. I wish to present some facts, and it is with this fact in mind at this time, with a large deficit in the Treasury, I submit that we are making a very large appropriation for a very small harbor, comparatively. Last year there was nothing, practically, expended. There was \$169 expended last year. We have on hand for that project a balance of \$17,000. Forty-five thousand dollars is proposed now for a project that is a mile and a quarter in length. The channel is 300 feet wide and 15 feet deep. It has only a nominal commerce, and it has no effect on freight rates.

My point is this: I do not move to strike out the paragraph, but it seems to me to be far better to allow a proposition of that kind to go over, or make a modest appropriation, than to make an appropriation of \$45,000 in view of the fact that we expended only \$169 last year.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma motion to strike out, for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that the necessary repairs are occasioned by storm and conditions of ice.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pawtucket River, R. I.: Completing improvement in accordance with report submitted in House Document No. 1283, Sixty-fourth, Congress, first session, \$61,440.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 3, by striking out lines 9, 10, 11, and 12.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I assume that this bill is to carry only the very important new projects that are to be considered. For that reason, from a reading of the Engineer's report, which I have read very carefully, and from the examination that has been made, it does not seem to me that this is a project that really needs to be acted upon at this time. Already there have been \$507,000 spent upon this river. The channel is 15 to 18 feet deep and has been completed for its length, 3 or 4 miles. The report says that, so far as known, the existing project has had no effect on freight rates. The expenditures in 1916 were \$16.67. This new project is to widen a channel for towing barges at a cost of \$61,440.

On page 2 the report says:

Owing to the amount of rock in the upper part of the channel the district officer states that it is not practicable to provide increased depth at a reasonable cost, and he believes that the present project depth of 18 feet should be retained.

So it is not to dig a deeper channel, but to widen it. Reading from page 3:

The principal traffic is in coal handled by barges in tow. Dealers in this commodity have desired a deeper channel in order to accommodate barges requiring a depth of about 18 feet, but it appears that any deepening would necessitate considerable excavation in ledge rock at excessive cost. As practically all the heavy tonnage is in vessels handled in tows, the present channel width of 100 feet is considered inadequate, and the district officer recommends that it be increased to 150 feet at an estimated cost of \$61,440.

The Army engineers report against any deepening. There is not a regular boat line, I take it from reading the report. Turning to page 8, appears the possibility of organizing a boat line, where the report says in a clipping from a newspaper:

The feasibility of establishing steamboat service between New York and this city was considered at length yesterday at a regular meeting of the State harbor improvement commissioners at headquarters in the statehouse. No action was taken, and the question will be discussed again later.

For all these reasons it does not appear to me to be a very important project to carry on at this time. It may be eventu-

ally but does not seem to be necessary now, and that is the reason I move to strike it out.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] to strike out the item contained in this bill for the further improvement of Pawtucket River, R. I. This Pawtucket River project extends partly through a portion of the district I have the honor to represent in this House and partly through a portion of the district represented by my colleague on the other side of this Chamber. The report of the Army engineers who have surveyed this project contains a strong recommendation of the same, and upon it I think the House is altogether justified in retaining this appropriation in the bill.

On page 3 of the Report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated June 20, 1916, I find the following paragraph:

It will be seen that the commerce on this river is large both in tonnage and in value. The greater part of it is handled in tows, and difficulty is experienced in keeping in the narrow channel, particularly when passing other tows. Some increase in width is considered essential to safety and convenience, and it appears that this can be secured at a reasonable cost. While greater depth would be of some advantage, it is not attainable within limits of justifiable cost on account of the ledge rock bottom. In view of the foregoing the board concurs with the district officer in the opinion that it is advisable to modify the existing project by increasing the width of the channel from 100 feet to 150 feet at an estimated cost of \$61,440, which amount should be made available in one appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, the statement just made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] respecting the total amount expended upon all projects connected with this river is true. The river has been under improvement since 1867. But the gentleman failed to tell you that the State of Rhode Island has contributed with some degree of liberality toward the improvement of this river. The river and harbor act of March 3, 1907, laid down the condition that in the prosecution of the work the State of Rhode Island should contribute \$67,792 toward the cost of the improvement. The State complied with this condition. Besides this, Mr. Chairman, the State of Rhode Island since 1911 has expended the sum of \$74,595.43 in the acquisition of land and the building of a quay wall in the upper part of the river at Pawtucket, in order to provide better terminal facilities and easier outlets for commerce.

The test to be applied in the determination of questions such as this should be the amount and value of the commerce carried upon the river. Applying this test to this particular project the tonnage figures indicate that this river is a considerable artery of commerce. During the past three years approximately 540,000 tons, valued at \$6,600,000, constitute the average of this river's carriage on 9,627 vessels, of which 4,802 were registered vessels of considerable size. The traffic on the river consists of coal barges and schooners carrying lumber and building material. Two steamers run regularly between Phillipsdale and New York, carrying iron and copper.

The part borne by the State of Rhode Island in the improvement of this river and in furnishing facilities for commerce thereon shows the interest which that State has taken in river and harbor development. It does not and never has depended entirely upon the National Treasury in the matter of river and harbor improvement. On the contrary, it has always manifested a spirit of cooperation with the National Government by making equitable State contributions toward its own river and harbor improvements. This willingness on the part of the State to contribute is the best evidence of the necessity and importance of the contemplated improvement.

The length of the improved portion of the Pawtucket River, including that portion which is called the Seekonk, lower down, between Red Bridge at Providence and Division Street Bridge at Pawtucket, is about 3½ miles. The act of March 3, 1905, provided for a channel above the Red Bridge at Providence 16 feet deep at mean low water and 100 feet wide, the width being reduced to 50 feet through the ledge rock at Pawtucket. The act of March 3, 1909, authorized the expenditure of any balance after the completion of the above work in deepening the channel to 18 feet and increasing the width at such places as would best subserve the interests of commerce. The 16-foot project has been completed, the channel has been widened somewhat lower down the river near Phillipsdale, and an increased depth in the channel has been made through the ledge rock at the upper end of the river at Pawtucket. Commerce, however, is still hampered at the upper end of the improvement and will continue to remain so unless the channel through the ledge rock at Pawtucket is made considerably wider. It is earnestly hoped that the Army engineers will recognize the commercial necessities of such an increase and report favorably thereon at an early date in accordance with the survey authorized and directed under the terms of the present bill.

Mr. Chairman, the population of Rhode Island is given up almost entirely to manufacturing and industrial pursuits. The products of that State's 2,200 or more manufacturing concerns, employing about 125,000 wage earners, are well known the world over, consisting as they do of about every article of manufacture that makes for the comfort and convenience of mankind. But for raw materials and foodstuffs Rhode Island is dependent upon the products of other States. We exchange the products of our factories for the things which we can not produce ourselves. Any plan or project which will bring us into closer commercial and fraternal relations with other States deserves to be commended and indorsed. The city of Pawtucket, located at the headwaters of the Pawtucket River, about 4 miles up from Narragansett Bay, has no access by water to the great centers of population which lie to the south except through the channel which the appropriation contained in this bill proposes to widen. The merchants of that city are anxiously awaiting this river improvement which they believe will afford cheaper rates of transportation and give to northern Rhode Island and the territory surrounding increased and more adequate commercial facilities.

Mr. Chairman, this paragraph relative to the appropriation for the Pawtucket River is altogether justifiable. It should remain in the bill, and the motion, therefore, of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] should be promptly defeated.

Mr. Chairman, this river for which this appropriation was recommended rises in the vicinity of Worcester, Mass., and flows about 50 miles, emptying into Providence Harbor at Providence, R. I., the headwaters of Narragansett Bay. From its source to the falls at Pawtucket it is known as the Blackstone River, named after William Blackstone, the first settler of Boston, who afterwards settled on its banks. From Worcester, Mass., this river falls 450 feet to salt water at Pawtucket, and in its general southeasterly course it has for a number of years turned more mill wheels than any other river of similar size in the country.

Navigation above the falls at Pawtucket was formerly carried on through a canal, known as the Blackstone Canal, which entered Providence Harbor and connected the city of Worcester with the city of Providence. This canal, which has long since been abandoned, pursued a northerly course, entering the valley of the Pawtucket River and following the river valley to Worcester. It was 45 miles long, 4 feet deep, 34 feet wide at the top and 18 feet wide at the bottom. It contained 48 locks, 80 by 10 feet. It was completed in 1828 at a cost of \$750,000. The opening of this canal first engaged public attention in 1796.

The plan of opening this waterway from Narragansett Bay, in Rhode Island, into the heart of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was conceived by John Brown, one of the early inhabitants of Providence. A charter was obtained in Rhode Island, but the petition of inhabitants of Worcester County, Mass., praying for incorporation for the opening of this enterprise was refused by the General Court of the Commonwealth, whereupon the undertaking was abandoned. In 1822, however, the plan was revived and subscriptions opened for a survey. Meetings were held both in Providence and Worcester at which the subject was discussed and a unanimous sentiment expressed that canal navigation in the valley of the Blackstone should be opened with all possible expedition. Committees were appointed to further investigate the subject. With the funds subscribed by individuals, they engaged Benjamin Wright, Esq., chief engineer upon the middle section of the great Erie Canal, to make a topographical survey of the route; to examine the character of the soil; to ascertain whether the supplies of water were sufficient; to estimate the expense of construction; and to report thereon. The survey was commenced, the levels taken, and the whole completed by Mr. Wright, assisted by two engineers, in September, 1822. Mr. Wright concluded his report, submitted October 2, 1822, by expressing the hope of seeing this important improvement accomplished for the benefit of New England. Acts of incorporation were obtained for distinct companies in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. The companies united July 5, 1825, under the name of the Blackstone Canal Company. The excavation was begun in Rhode Island in 1824 and the first earth was removed in Massachusetts in 1826. The enterprise was completed in 1828, and on October 7 of that year the first boat, *Lady Carrington*, passed through the Blackstone Canal. For more than a decade navigation proceeded, 12 freight boats and 1 passenger boat plying up and down the new waterway. In the early forties, however, disputes arose concerning water power in the mill privileges along the Blackstone, which impeded navigation and finally operated to discontinue the canal.

Between the city of Pawtucket and Providence Harbor flows that portion of the river which is known as the Pawtucket and

the Seekonk. The Seekonk is of the tidal type, and through it navigation is carried on up to the city of Pawtucket. The Seekonk is the river made famous by Roger Williams, who, after his banishment from Massachusetts, with five companions embarked in a canoe and paddled across its waters in 1636. On the opposite shore, so the story goes, they paused in their journey to receive the salutations of a group of Indians, who greeted them with the cry, "What cheer, Netop," which some historians translate "What good news, friend?" and others "How are you, friend?" The spot where he landed tradition calls Slate Rock; but concerning what was said and done at that first meeting there are no records extant. Reembarking, Williams and his companions, history tells us, paddled down the Seekonk River to its mouth, and, turning to the right around the promontory, they entered an estuary of Narragansett Bay. Proceeding northward, they reached the spot where the waters of the Woonasquatucket commingled with those of the Moshassuck River. Here at the foot of the hill at the fringe of the primeval forest they disembarked and discovered a spring of sparkling water. This place was to be their home. Here were laid the foundations of a great city, which Williams named Providence, a city whose corporate seal bears the legend, "What cheer"—the salutation received by the first settler and his companions from the Indians who greeted them as they paddled their journey across the Seekonk.

Mr. Chairman, this river which bears the triple name of the Blackstone, the Pawtucket, and the Seekonk has played an important part in the history and development of the sections through which it passes, and the crossing of its lower waters by one of the early apostles of liberty marked an epoch in the twilight hours of American history. But it is with the future commercial possibilities of this river from Pawtucket down to the broad expanse of waters in Narragansett Bay that we are especially concerned in this appropriation. The city of Pawtucket is a great industrial center. North of Pawtucket along the valley of the Blackstone is a network of industrial and manufacturing centers that will be commercially benefited by improvement in navigation upon this river. In this valley there is a population of 150,000 people, and the number is constantly increasing. In the 10 years from 1905 to 1915 the measure of increase was in the neighborhood of 20 per cent. The value of the products in the various establishments of this section is over \$100,000,000. It is a self-evident proposition that as population is multiplied and industrial output increased both in amount and value, and such will hereafter be the case in this progressive center, all the available highways of commerce must be opened, improved, and maintained; otherwise industrial progress must necessarily be checked and the chances of commercial development greatly retarded in the future.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I base my opposition very largely on the engineer's report as applied to the existing project. On page 127 of the engineer's report we find, as stated by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY], that one of the conditions of the modification of the act of 1907 was that the State of Rhode Island should itself contribute \$67,792, and this condition was complied with, showing cooperation of the local community. That is one of the factors that that Committee on Rivers and Harbors is invariably trying to have carried out, local cooperation, either by the State, the municipality, or other form of local unit. It seems to me that this cooperation having been carried out by the State shows the interest in the locality in the project itself. It is stated that the channel is a narrow one. The improvement as contemplated by the project we are adopting in this bill will increase the usefulness of the channel reaching to Pawtucket. Then we have the schedule of freight. The traffic to Pawtucket is in barges, and its value is very large. In 1915 it amounted to \$5,677,875. It seems to me that the item is meritorious and should remain in the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will, in that connection, call attention to the report of Col. Abbot, which will be found in House Document 1283, recommending this project, and the last paragraph of which reads as follows:

It will be seen that the commerce on this river is large both in tonnage and in value. The greater part of it is handled in tows and difficulty is experienced in keeping in the narrow channel, particularly when passing other tows. Some increase in width is considered essential to safety and convenience, and it appears that this can be secured at reasonable cost. While greater depth would be of some advantage, it is not attainable within limits of justifiable cost on account of the ledge rock bottom. In view of the foregoing, the board concurs with the district officer in the opinion that it is advisable to modify the existing project by increasing the width of the channel from 100 feet to 150 feet at an estimated cost of \$61,440, which amount should be made available in one appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin,

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Norwalk Harbor, Conn.: For maintenance, \$8,000; for improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1143, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$50,000; in all, \$58,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all of that part of the paragraph after the figures "\$8,000," in line 20, page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 3, line 20, by striking out all of the paragraph after the figures "\$8,000" in line 20.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this is another of the new projects relating to Norwalk. On page 13 of House Document No. 143—

16. In view of the considerations detailed I am of the opinion that Norwalk Harbor, Conn., is worthy of further improvement to the extent of providing—

A main channel 12 feet deep from the 12-foot curve in the Sheffield Island Harbor to the highway bridge at South Norwalk, 200 feet wide to Dorlons Point, thence 150 feet wide to South Norwalk, and 250 feet wide along the wharf frontage of South Norwalk.

An anchorage basin 10 feet deep and about 17 acres in area in the upper harbor.

A channel 10 feet deep and generally 150 feet wide, with increased width at the turns, from South Norwalk to the head of navigation in the Norwalk River.

The maintenance of the existing channel 6 feet deep and 75 feet wide along the east side of the harbor to the head of navigation at East Norwalk.

The estimated cost of the improvement is \$218,000 for the initial improvement, \$8,000 annually for the first three years, and \$4,000 annually thereafter for maintenance.

17. The proposed outer channel is regarded as suitable for the navigation of vessels of a maximum draft of 10 feet at all usual tides, 11½ feet at mean low water, and 18 feet at mean high water; the channel above South Norwalk for vessels of a maximum draft of 9½ feet at mean low water and 16 feet at mean high water; the channel to East Norwalk for vessels of 12 feet draft at mean high water, for which vessels, respectively, these channels are designed.

18. Should the project be adopted by Congress, the work should be prosecuted in the interests of economy at a rate sufficient to secure its completion in three years. To this end an initial appropriation of \$88,000 is necessary, followed by two appropriations of \$65,000 each.

G. B. PILLSBURY,
Major, Corps of Engineers.

I propose to show later with reference to this and other items that there is a disposition to put on the initial project enough to fasten it on Congress so that hereafter we will make the additional appropriation. Here an initial appropriation of \$8,000 is to be made. We have spent \$207,000 on the harbor. Nine thousand one hundred and fifty dollars is the balance on hand, and that \$9,150 balance is to be used as follows: Eight thousand dollars for maintenance; administration, \$1,150; and of the new amount of \$8,000 the engineer says \$7,000 is for maintenance, and \$1,000 is for administration.

Now, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what this administration is for, taking, as it does, usually about 15 per cent and sometimes as high as 33 per cent of the appropriation. What does it go for and what is the immediate necessity for it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have a statement here, as I anticipated some question of this kind might come up, so I asked the Chief of Engineers to make a statement, and I will submit it to the gentleman. He gives the different purposes for which the expenditures are made.

He says:

In the office of the Chief of Engineers, expenses for the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, including the pay of the resident member of the board.

Services of technical and other assistants aside from statutory positions.

Telegrams and long-distance telephone service on river and harbor matters.

Express and freight charges.

Mileage of officers and assistants traveling on river and harbor duty.

That, I think, answers the questions of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FREAR. Does the chairman think that 15 per cent is a proper amount for that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, I can not say as to that.

Mr. FREAR. Does the gentleman think from 15 to 30 per cent—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, it frequently is not as high as that. When it is 15 per cent it is apt to be caused by the fact that the appropriations were very small. In the larger appropriations it amounts to less than 10 per cent.

Mr. FREAR. I will read one or two other extracts from this report:

10. The wharves contiguous to this waterway are located at Norwalk, South Norwalk, and East Norwalk and are the usual pile or crib structures used for that purpose. A short distance above South Norwalk there are located the wharves which served the Danbury & Norwalk Railroad when this line had its terminus at the port. These docks still have rail connections, but are not in their present con-

dition available for use. A public wharf is regarded as desirable, both at Norwalk and South Norwalk, at such points on the water front convenient to the highways as could be most advantageously secured by the local authorities.

In other words, there seems to be no terminal facilities there whatever, and it seems that this is to be provided for after the appropriation is made. If we appropriate anything, we ought to appropriate the full amount asked for by the engineers.

Now, I am unable to reply to some arguments that have been made. Under the rule I can not reply. I moved to strike this out because it does not seem to be of pressing necessity.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee. I would like to inquire whether or not it is a fact that when these items were under consideration the assistant to the Chief of the Army Engineers was not present at the meeting, and members of the committee who attended had full opportunity to interrogate him in regard to the projects, and particularly with respect to items concerning which the gentleman from Wisconsin makes inquiry?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman is correct. As I recall, Col. Newcomer, from the Office of the Chief of Engineers, was before the committee during the entire time we were considering the new projects in this bill.

Mr. FREAR. Would the chairman believe the testimony of this gentleman as superior to the engineer or the Chief of Engineers, the engineer who was upon the particular project, and the engineer who approved it—which testimony would he prefer?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not care to show any distinction. Both are worthy of belief. Besides, I am willing to stand upon the report, and I fancy every other gentleman here is willing to do the same, whether he votes for or against the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FREAR. This report calls for \$88,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Greenwich Harbor, Conn.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 289, Sixty-third Congress, first session, \$35,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 4, by striking out lines 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, we have appropriated about \$27,000 already, and this project calls for \$35,000 more. On page 3 of the report, House Document 289, Sixty-third Congress, first session, we find a statement that the total commerce is 96,000 tons, of which sand and so on and lumber are the principal features, and that practically only 7,500 tons of merchandise was carried last year. We find the statement that a regular freight steamer plies between Greenwich and New York and handles about 25,000 tons, the balance being carried in barges and schooners. On page 5 of the report we find the following respecting terminal facilities:

The terminal facilities of the harbor are thought to be adequate for the present and prospective commerce. There are two wharves owned by the town, but neither is so situated as to be of benefit to commerce at the present time. There are two private wharves to which the public have access on equal terms on payment of wharfage, and wharves connected with the establishments of dealers in coal, lumber, and building materials, the use of which by outside parties is sometimes granted as an accommodation. None of these wharves have rail connections, and the wharves for the general use of the public are not provided with handling facilities.

I again urge, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing contained here which shows an immediate necessity for this project. They have no terminal facilities to supply the needs of the people there and it should not be allowed to stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Connecticut River, Conn.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance below Hartford, \$70,100.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert a new paragraph, after line 7, on page 4, as follows: "Connecticut River, above Hartford, Conn., to Holyoke, Mass.: For improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 417, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$520,000."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, this is a new project and one which in my estimation is as worthy as any of those which

have been included in the bill by the committee. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors has visited the Connecticut River and it is not necessary for me to take the time either of the House or of the committee in explaining the merits of this project. It is fully covered in House Document No. 417, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, and the amendment which I have offered is in accordance with that recommendation, as described by the report of the Chief of Engineers, Gen. Kingman.

The Connecticut River is a project that has been before Congress for a good many years, and it is the one project which has been used as an example of the value and of the necessity of cooperation between the Federal Government and private corporations developing hydroelectric power. We have upon that stream going to waste day in and day out an estimated horsepower of about 35,000, and in addition to that we not alone lose the hydroelectric development, but the opportunity for commerce and the reduction of freight rates. That whole subject is thoroughly covered in the report which I hold in my hand.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. My time is very brief. If it is a brief question I will be glad to yield to the gentleman, but I desire to conclude my statement before my five minutes have expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Go on, and I will get the gentleman more time. I want to have the project explained.

Mr. TREADWAY. There are many projects, as I have said, where there should be cooperation between the hydroelectric companies and the Federal Government, and that is exactly what this report covers. Gen. Kingman's report says that unless such a contract is entered into by the Government and the local corporations in a reasonable length of time, then the Government should undertake this entire project. I maintain that the reasonable length of time has expired, and I am, therefore, urging the adoption of the project at this time. Unfortunately, in spite of its merits the committee is not in favor of it, because the so-called Adamson-Shields bill trouble continues to exist.

In that connection I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that a conference was agreed upon between the two branches of Congress on July 21, 1916, on the water-power bill, as appears in our calendar, and I am reliably informed that that conference has never as yet so much as met. It seems to me gross neglect on somebody's part that such a conference as that, having to do with as important a subject as this, has never so much as tried to reach an agreement as to the form of bill to report to the two branches. I am a rock-ribbed Republican, but I do commend our President for the effort I see by the public press he has made within the last few days to prod up that conference committee. They need it. At any rate, we need the opportunity to develop the Connecticut River, both for its hydroelectric opportunities and likewise for its commercial necessity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given two minutes more in order that I may ask him some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What depth of water do you expect to get at the upper part of this improvement?

Mr. TREADWAY. The report calls for 12 feet at Holyoke.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But there is only 12 feet at Hartford.

Mr. TREADWAY. We expect to get the same; and if the gentleman will take the pains to read the report he will find it very easy to get it. The bargain is that the Government shall expend \$1,870,000 and that outside parties shall double that amount. As we were speaking about being traders, it seems to me to be a good bargain to enter into.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. With that statement I am heartily in favor, and I wish it could be applied to all the items in this bill, but continuing further. The gentleman says it is easy to get 12 feet at the upper end of this improvement. I understand it is extremely difficult to maintain 12 feet at Hartford.

Mr. TREADWAY. No, sir; there is a tidewater depth at Hartford of 12 feet. The project I have referred to is the building of a lock and dam to be donated to the Government. The Government is not going to pay for it, but people are anxious to build it, if they can get any kind of terms on which to make a trade with the Government.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the report say it requires continual dredging to maintain the 12 feet?

Mr. TREADWAY. This has nothing to do with the project below Hartford. That project is from Hartford to the sea, but this is a project from Hartford up the river to Holyoke.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I was speaking of the project of improvement below Hartford, which I understand requires constant dredging to maintain 12 feet of water.

Mr. TREADWAY. Below Hartford the existing project has an appropriation of—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not say that I am opposed to this proposition, but I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman, who has himself very frankly given the reason why his amendment should not be adopted, and that is mainly because, I may say it is entirely because, the Adamson-Shields bill, or some similar measure, has not yet become a law. Until that is done it is the policy of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, as I think it has been that of the House itself, not to adopt projects involving the development of water power. Until Congress has laid down some rule defining the exact relation that the Government and corporations or individuals desiring to use such power sustain to each other and the terms upon which the power is to be used, I think it unwise to take on any of these improvements or any project involving the development of water power. A similar question has been presented regarding the Muscle Shoals improvement, as will be remembered by most of the Members here, as the proposition has been discussed several times on this floor, and Congress has not as yet, for the same reason, found itself in a position to adopt that project, a worthy one though it is.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TREADWAY. I just wanted to ask a question before he left the question of the Connecticut River, and that is the gentleman said, so far as he knows, that the reason it had not been adopted was this lack of amendment to the Adamson general dam act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe I did put it that strongly; perhaps I ought not to have done that at this time; but I will say, nevertheless, that if this Adamson-Shields bill, or some similar bill, were the law I think the project covered by the gentleman's amendment would commend itself to the favorable consideration of this House.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask the gentleman one other question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman may.

Mr. TREADWAY. I infer, then, from the remarks of the chairman of the committee that he considers the project of itself, as described in the report, meritorious?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I so consider it; but I think it unwise under the circumstances to adopt it or any similar project at this time, hence I am opposed to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, N. Y. AND VT.

Narrows of Lake Champlain, N. Y. and Vt.: For maintenance, \$5,000; for improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1387, Sixty-second Congress, third session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$300; in all, \$305,000.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of placing the data covering the New York items in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, the items and data are as follows:

The Narrows of Lake Champlain is that portion of the lake at its southern end, 37 miles long, located between Whitehall and Crown Point, N. Y. The portion under improvement is that extending from Whitehall, N. Y., at the southern extremity of the lake, northerly to Benson Landing, Vt., a distance of 15 miles. Burlington Harbor, Vt., is 80 miles by water north of Whitehall, and New York City is 214 miles south by water via the Champlain Canal and the Hudson River.

This waterway is a link in the great international waterway between Montreal and New York, which was formerly the controlling factor in fixing freight rates in this locality. Its influence is still strong, though it has declined recently, owing to the deterioration of the Champlain Canal, but is expected to be revived on the approaching completion of the New York State barge canal system, with its facilities for larger and more modern boats.

The commerce is carried by fleets of canal boats of about 5 feet draft towed by tugs of a maximum draft of about 12 feet. As obtained from transportation companies and reports of clearances on the Champlain Canal, the tonnage and value of this commerce are as follows:

Comparative statement.

Year.	Short tons.	Value.
1913.....	424,933	\$4,675,311
1914.....	466,700	4,448,438
1915.....	427,791	5,425,524

NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, N. Y. AND VT.—NEW PROJECT.

Report of the Chief of Engineers, printed in House Document 1387, Sixty-second Congress, third session:

The present project for the improvement of the Narrows of Lake Champlain, adopted in 1899, provides for the widening of the channel and restoration of the depth to 12 feet at low water, and the placing of fenders at certain points to protect barges from collision with the rocky banks of the channel. This project was completed in 1905, and subsequent expenditures have been applied to maintenance. To adapt this channel to the boats which will use it upon completion of the enlarged Champlain Canal and communicating waterways the district officer submits, with favorable recommendation, a project providing for a channel 12 feet deep and 200 feet wide, except at one point through rock, where the width is reduced to 150 feet. The estimated cost of this plan, including the placing of new fender booms, is \$737,000, and \$5,000 annually for maintenance.

These reports have been referred, as required by law, to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and attention is invited to the board's report of February 6, 1913, concurring generally with the views of the district officer. The board is not satisfied that the cut-offs at Maple Bend and Chilton Bend may not be omitted without serious inconvenience to navigation and with a very material reduction in cost. If the improvement be adopted by Congress, further study of this part of the channel should be made before the work is undertaken.

The Clerk read as follows:

PORT HENRY HARBOR, N. Y.—NEW PROJECT.

Port Henry Harbor, N. Y.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 369, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$71,500.

Mr. HULBERT. I now wish to insert Report of the Chief of Engineers, printed in House Document No. 369, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session:

Port Henry is located on the southwest shore of Lake Champlain, 2 miles northwest of Crown Point. It is the distributing point of the Port Henry iron-ore district, the principal mines being at Mineville, about 6 miles back from the lake shore and connected with Port Henry by rail. The annual shipments of ore during the past three years have averaged about 800,000 tons, and the receipts, chiefly coal and merchandise, have averaged from 125,000 to 170,000 tons. Only about 5 per cent of this commerce is now handled by water on account of the small depth of Lake Champlain Canal, but the enlargement of this canal to a depth of 12 feet is approaching completion. To assist in the development of the port the State of New York has adopted a project for the construction of a modern terminal at considerable cost. The present depth of water along the wharves is from 5 to 6 feet at low lake level, gradually increasing to the eastward. The district officer, who is also the division engineer, believes that the harbor should be given a depth sufficient to permit its use by boats of the maximum dimensions which the canals admit. He submits a project providing ultimately for the dredging of a strip 1,000 feet wide, covering an area of about 50 acres, to a depth of 12 feet at low lake level, and protecting this area by a breakwater, at a total estimated cost of \$385,500. Pending the development of a commensurate commerce, however, he proposes to limit the improvement to the dredging of a strip 500 feet wide, covering an area of about 40 acres, at a total estimated cost of \$81,500, of which local interests offer to pay \$10,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

OGDENSBURG HARBOR, N. Y.—NEW PROJECT.

Ogdensburg Harbor, N. Y.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 663, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, \$54,000.

Mr. HULBERT. I now wish to insert Report of the Chief of Engineers, printed in House Document No. 663, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session:

The present project for improvement of this harbor, adopted by the river and harbor act approved June 25, 1910, and completed in 1913, provides for deepening the several channels of the harbor to 19 feet at low water and for removing wholly the middle ground between the two lower entrance channels, at an estimated cost of \$187,970. Under this and prior projects the United States has provided an upper entrance channel, a lower entrance channel and basin, and a channel about 1 mile in length along the city front wharves connecting the two entrances, all to a depth of 19 feet below low water on the Ogdensburg gauge. The upper entrance channel has a width of from 300 to 450 feet, the narrowest part being at its inner end, where it joins the channel along the city front. The district officer states that there is difficulty in navigating around the bend at the junction of these channels, and there is also some difficulty at times in navigating the portion of the city front channel to the west of Caroline Street, where it abruptly decreases in width from 350 to 200 feet. The necessary relief would be afforded by widening this part of the channel to 350 feet, easing the bend at the junction and widening the inner end of the upper entrance channel to 400 feet. The district officer estimates the cost of this work at \$54,000. He believes that the expenditure involved is justified by the commercial importance of the harbor, which has a traffic of about 1,000,000 tons a year, and in this opinion the division engineer concurs.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK HARBOR: AMBROSE, MAIN SHIP, BAYSIDE, AND GEDNEY CHANNELS.

New York Harbor, N. Y.: For maintenance, including Ambrose Channel, \$40,000; for improvement of the upper bay, opposite anchorage grounds, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 518, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$200,000; for completing improvement at Craven Shoal in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 557, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, \$30,000; in all, \$270,000.

Mr. HULBERT. I now wish to add:

New York Harbor consists of the Upper Bay, 4 miles long and 4 miles wide, connected with the Lower Bay by the Narrows, over a mile in width. The Lower Bay is triangular, extending 12 miles inland, with one side about 6 miles long open to the sea, from which it is separated by a broad bar crossed by five channels. Two of these channels have been improved under this title—Ambrose Channel and the Gedney-Bayside Channel, with its extension, Main Ship Channel. The inner end of these channels is 10 miles south from the Battery, New York City.

The existing project is entirely completed—the Main Ship-Bayside-Gedney Channel in 1891 and Ambrose Channel in 1914. The depth in the Main Ship-Bayside-Gedney Channel has been increased from 23.7 feet to 30 feet. The width, dredged to 1,000 feet, has since decreased to 500 feet in the narrowest part of Main Ship Channel. The depth in Ambrose Channel has been increased from 16 feet to 40 feet over a width of 2,000 feet, and has been fully maintained. The maximum draft which can now be carried through these channels at mean low tide is: Main Ship-Bayside-Gedney Channel, 30½ feet; Ambrose Channel, 40 feet. Ships under steam are liable to draw from 1 to 4 feet or more in excess of their drafts at piers. The 30-foot channel was constructed at 2 per cent above the estimated cost, due to shoaling during progress. The 40-foot channel, estimated to cost \$6,688,000, was constructed at a saving of about \$1,500,000. In the table following is shown the total expenditures to June 30, 1916:

The funds now available for maintenance, including Ambrose Channel, Gedney and Main Ship Channels, will be applied to maintenance of New York Harbor by collection and removal of drift, under authority of the river and harbor act of 1915, involving expenditures of approximately \$5,000 a month during summer and \$3,000 a month during winter, and to removal of shoals in the channels as they may occur. The funds available for Ambrose Channel will meet all anticipated expenditures until June 30, 1918, and no further appropriation is now needed. These funds will be applied to the maintenance of United States plant when not at work, and to removal of shoals should any be found in the channel.

The funds estimated for profitable expenditure during the year ending June 30, 1918, it is proposed to apply to maintenance by collection and removal of drift, at the rates of expenditure above named, and to removal of shoals such as may be found to obstruct the channels.

No complete record of domestic or coastwise commerce are available. The following table contains a record of foreign commerce only:

Comparative statement.

Fiscal year.	Short tons.	Value.
1913.....	15,552,676	\$2,140,243,057
1914.....	15,238,057	2,056,847,222
1915.....	17,885,893	2,216,337,518

NEW YORK HARBOR, N. Y., UPPER BAY, OPPOSITE ANCHORAGE GROUNDS—NEW PROJECT.

The following report of the Board of Engineers, in which the Chief of Engineers concurs, is printed in House Document 518, Sixty-third Congress, second session:

The main anchorage grounds in upper New York Bay are located on the west side of the main channel, along the Jersey shore, and in order to provide sufficient area these anchorages extend out into the deep water leaving a minimum channel width of 370 feet for vessels drawing 40 feet and over and 1,000 for vessels drawing 30 feet. Experience with enormous traffic in this harbor indicates that this width is insufficient.

To provide the necessary unobstructed channelway, a plan of improvement is proposed for a channel 2,000 feet wide and 40 feet deep, the west side of the channel to skirt the eastern edge of the anchorage grounds. The project proposed is in effect an extension of the Ambrose Channel into and through the upper bay and may be considered as a necessary enlargement of the existing project. An estimate for the excavation of this channel with the regular New York Harbor dredges is presented in the sum of \$830,000, and the district officer and the division engineer are of opinion that the demands of navigation are sufficient to warrant the improvement at this cost. No accurate estimate for maintenance can be given, but the district officer states that it will probably not exceed \$50,000 annually, and may fall much below that sum.

The dimensions proposed for this channel correspond with those of the Ambrose Channel of entrance to New York Harbor, and it appears from experience that practically such dimensions are required to meet the constantly increasing demands of navigation, particularly during foggy weather, at which time a commodious channel is essential to insure reasonable safety.

NEW YORK HARBOR, N. Y.—REMOVAL OF CRAVEN SHOAL—NEW PROJECT.

Report of the Chief of Engineers, printed in House Document No. 557, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session:

Craven Shoal lies in the west part of the main channel from lower New York Bay to upper New York Bay, a mile south of the Narrows and 1½ miles above the head of Ambrose Channel. The minimum depth on the shoal is 19.6 feet. Sailing vessels and tows of barges are prohibited by law from using Ambrose Channel, but in order to avoid striking the buoys marking Craven Shoal they are practically forced to follow the same track as steamers at this point. The district officer, who is also the division engineer, submits an estimate of cost amounting to \$30,000 for removing the shoal to a depth of 30 feet, and expresses the opinion that this work is worthy of being undertaken by the United States. It seems probable that the shoal, once removed, would not form again and the cost of maintenance may be regarded as negligible.

The Clerk read as follows:

HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NEW YORK HARBOR.

Hudson River Channel, New York Harbor, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$210,500; for improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1697, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, \$600,000; in all, \$810,500.

Mr. HULBERT. I now wish to add:

This project (H. Doc. No. 719, 62d Cong., 2d sess.) was adopted by river and harbor act of March 4, 1913, as modified by river and harbor act of March 4, 1915 (see Annual Report for 1914, pp. 234 and 235), and provides for a channel 800 feet wide and 30 feet deep at mean low water from deep water off Ellis Island to 1,300 feet below the foot of Newark Street, Hoboken; thence to Castle Point and the removal of a shoal to a depth of 40 feet; a channel 550 feet wide and 26 feet deep along the Weehawken-Edgewater water front; the removal to a depth of 40 feet of ledge rock lying about 1,000 feet southwest of Pier A at the Battery; the removal of a shoal on the New York side, between West Nineteenth and Thirty-second Streets, to a depth of 40 feet; and the removal of an obstruction north of the mouth of Spuyten Duyvil Creek to the depth of the surrounding river bottom. Estimated cost, \$1,570,000. The length of the projected channel in the Jersey City-Hoboken water front is about 3 miles, and of the channel in the Weehawken-Edgewater water front about 5 miles. The total length of river included in the improvement is about 16 miles.

The work done under all projects has resulted in removing rock off Pier A to 38 feet; in dredging a channel in the Jersey City water front 200 feet wide and 30 feet deep; in completing the removal of the shoal in the Hoboken water front to a depth of 40 feet; and in dredging a channel in the Weehawken-Edgewater water front 250 feet wide and 26 feet deep. The controlling depths on June 30, 1916, in the dredged channels are estimated at 30 feet in the Jersey City water front; 40 feet in the Hoboken water front, and 24 feet in the Weehawken-Edgewater water front. Up to June 30, 1916, about 36 per cent of the work proposed under the existing project has been completed, and the total expenditures thereunder amounted to \$558,740.68.

To complete the project it is necessary to widen the channels in the Jersey City and Weehawken-Edgewater water fronts, to complete the removal of the rock off Pier A, to remove the shoal on the New York side, and to remove the obstruction north of Spuyten Duyvil Creek.

The funds available June 30, 1916, together with those appropriated by the river and harbor act of July 27, 1916, will be expended in widening, by dredging, the channels along the Weehawken-Edgewater and the Jersey City water fronts. It is expected that this work will be commenced in the fall of 1916, and that the funds will be exhausted about August 1, 1917.

It is proposed to expend the funds, for which estimate is submitted in this report, as follows:

For dredging shoal from West Nineteenth Street to West Thirty-second Street, Manhattan.....	\$185,000
For rock removal, including ledge off Pier A.....	22,000
For removing obstruction north of Spuyten Duyvil Creek.....	3,500
Total.....	210,500

A shoal along the Manhattan water front obstructs the approach of deep-draft steamships to the piers, while the ledge off Pier A lies in the channel used by these vessels. They should therefore be removed as soon as practicable. The obstruction north of Spuyten Duyvil Creek has been the subject of numerous complaints and is a menace to navigation which should be removed.

As the result of a careful canvass, the commerce of the section of the Hudson River included for improvement under this title consists of all classes of commercial products and manufactures, and is as follows:

Comparative statement.

Calendar year.	Short tons.	Value.	Passengers carried.
1913.....	64,517,302	\$2,958,075,917	100,459,665
1914.....	58,644,614	4,559,185,809	106,253,639
1915.....	63,458,291	6,430,144,119	69,229,418

The tonnage is carried in vessels ranging in loaded draft from about 7 feet at all stages of the tide up to 38 feet at high water.

HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NEW YORK HARBOR, N. Y.—NEW PROJECT.

Report of the Chief of Engineers, printed in House Document No. 1697, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session:

The section of the harbor included under the name of Hudson River Channel extends from Ellis Island to the northern limits of New York City, a distance of about 16 miles. The width of the river within these limits varies from 2,725 to 5,400 feet. Originally the widths at various points were much greater, but they have been reduced as a result of water-front improvements and successive advances of the pierhead line to permit the lengthening of piers in keeping pace with the continuing increase in the size of trans-Atlantic steamships. A channel having a mean low-water depth of 40 feet and over and a minimum width of 1,000 feet extends throughout and some distance beyond the section covered by this examination. There are three extensive shoal areas bordering the channel in this reach, however, one off the Jersey City shore, extending from Ellis Island to Castle Point; one on the same shore, from Weehawken to above the northern limits of New York City; and the third on the New York shore, from West Nineteenth to about West Seventy-fifth Street. Some work on each of these shoals is contemplated under the present project, including the removal of the last-named shoal from West Nineteenth Street to West Thirty-second Street. Between West Forty-fourth and West Fifty-sixth Streets the city of New York has undertaken the construction of one pier 1,000 feet long, and proposes to construct two additional long piers at this site practically in continuation of the work now in progress. In order that these piers may be available for use by trans-Atlantic steamships upon completion, the district officer believes that the shoal along this front should be removed to a depth of 40 feet at mean low water from West Thirty-second Street to West Sixty-first Street. Between the Battery and Canal Street the channel is too narrow for safe navigation by the trans-Atlantic vessels, especially in view of the enormous traffic in this section by vessels traveling in all directions. In the opinion of the district officer, giving due consideration to economy, a width of 2,000 feet for the 40-foot channel in this section should be adopted for the present. He reaches the conclusion, in which the division engineer concurs, that the locality is worthy of additional improvement at the present time to the extent indicated, at a total estimated cost of \$1,320,000.

The first appropriation should be \$600,000, and the balance should be appropriated so as to complete the work within a period of three years.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK HARBOR, BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS—NEW PROJECT.

New York Harbor, N. Y.: For improvement of Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 863, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$200,000.

Mr. HULBERT. I now wish to insert Report of the Chief of Engineers, printed in House Document No. 863, Sixty-third Congress, second session:

These channels lie along the east shore of the Upper Bay, New York Harbor, and, with Buttermilk Channel, form an easterly channel along the Brooklyn water front from the Narrows to the East River. The combined length of Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels is 4½ miles.

The existing project for improvement of these channels, adopted in 1899, provides for a depth of 40 feet and a width of 1,200 feet. The commerce of the locality has grown from about 850,000 tons in 1886 to about 8,500,000 tons in 1913, and much larger vessels are now in use than formerly. The district officer reports that at the lower part of Bay Ridge Channel and the upper part of Red Hook Channel the width of 1,200 feet provided under the existing project is sufficient for present and anticipated needs, but he believes that some widening at and below the bend where Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels meet is necessary. The area of the proposed widening, as shown on accompanying map, comprises a triangle of approximately 90 acres at the junction of the two channels, the maximum additional width to be obtained being about 1,000 feet where it is most needed. The estimated cost of this work is \$920,000. In the opinion of the district officer the further improvement of the locality as proposed is worthy to be undertaken by the United States, and in this opinion the division engineer concurs.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK HARBOR, N. Y., BETWEEN STATEN ISLAND AND HOFFMAN ISLAND—NEW PROJECT.

New York Harbor, N. Y.: For improvement of channel between Staten Island and Hoffman Island in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 625, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, \$50,000.

Mr. HULBERT. I now wish to insert Report of the Chief of Engineers, printed in House Document No. 625, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session:

Hoffman Island is mainly an artificial island of about 11.5 acres, situated about 7,000 feet due south from the southeast point of Staten Island. The island belongs to the quarantine department of the port of New York, and is a receiving station for persons suspected of having contagious diseases, or who have been exposed to such diseases. Situated 4,500 feet farther south is Swinburne Island, having an area of about 1.9 acres, which is maintained by the quarantine department for the detention of actual sufferers from contagious disease. Both of these islands are west of the West Bank and can not be approached from the main channel to the east on account of the shoal water. The only approach which is now extensively used is the one from the north, but the depths in this channel are insufficient for vessels of the

size best adapted to the quarantine work. The improvement desired by the quarantine authorities is a channel sufficient to accommodate vessels of 15 feet draft, or 16 feet at mean low water. The district officer, who is also the division engineer, submits estimates of cost for providing a channel of this depth and 200 feet wide to Hoffman Island, amounting to \$118,000, and for extending the channel to Swinburne Island, amounting to \$142,000, a total of \$260,000. In view of the importance of the quarantine service to the great commerce of the port of New York, it is advisable for the United States to undertake the improvement of the locality to this extent.

The Clerk read as follows:

WESTCHESTER CREEK, N. Y.—NEW PROJECT.

Westchester Creek, N. Y.: For improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 370, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$58,000: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any lands required for the purpose of this improvement.

Mr. HULBERT. I now wish to insert Report of the Chief of Engineers, printed in House Document No. 370, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session:

Westchester Creek enters an estuary on the north side of East River, about 14 miles east of the Battery, New York City. The present project, adopted by the river and harbor act of June 25, 1910, provides for a channel 8 feet deep at mean low water and 100 feet wide across the estuary; thence 80 feet wide to about 1,000 feet above Scrivens Wharf; and thence 60 feet wide to the head of navigation, at an estimated cost of \$91,280. The project is practically completed. The commerce has increased from about 50,000 tons in 1891 to 169,164 tons in 1912 and 589,322 tons in 1914. The existing navigation facilities appear to be inadequate for the proper handling of the vessels engaged in traffic on this stream. The district officer, who is also the division engineer, estimates that to increase the depth to 10 feet and the width to 150 feet, as specified in the river and harbor act of March 4, 1913, will cost \$375,000. He deems this expenditure larger than resulting benefits would warrant, but believes the locality is worthy of further improvement to the extent of providing a channel 10 feet deep, 125 feet wide at Unionport and Westchester, and 100 feet wide elsewhere, at an estimated cost of \$291,000 for construction and \$1,500 annually for maintenance.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurs in general with the views of the district officer, but believes that a width of 100 feet throughout will fairly well serve the needs of commerce, and that any additional width required in order to reach the wharves at Unionport and Westchester should be provided by the interests concerned. The estimated cost of the project as thus modified is \$208,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

EAST RIVER, N. Y.—NEW PROJECT.

East River, N. Y.: Continuing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 188, Sixty-third Congress, first session, \$500,000: *Provided*, That so much as may be necessary of this and any other appropriations made for specific portions of New York Harbor and its immediate tributaries may be allotted by the Secretary of War for the maintenance of these waterways by the collection and removal of drift.

Mr. HULBERT. I now wish to insert Report of the Chief of Engineers, printed in House Document No. 188, Sixty-third Congress, first session:

The East River forms the eastern entrance to New York Harbor through the waters of Long Island Sound. The existing project for its improvement, adopted in 1868, provides for the removal of certain obstructions to a depth of 26 feet below mean low water. The removal of additional obstructions has been added to this project from time to time, but no change in the project depth has been made, notwithstanding the great increase in size and draft of vessels since the project was adopted. The district officer was of opinion that a depth of 35 feet in the through channel is now required to meet the needs of navigation, and he presented a plan providing for this depth and a width of 900 feet, excepting in the reach west of Blackwells Island and in the short reaches opposite Negro Point and the Sunken Meadows, where the width would be restricted to about 600 feet. The estimated cost of this work is \$10,504,500. In addition to the through channel, the district officer was of opinion that certain work should be done to give access to the wharves, and other work should be undertaken to diminish the tidal velocities through Hell Gate. The work required to give access to the wharves involves the removal of a number of shoals and isolated rocks and is estimated to cost \$10,451,337. The work recommended primarily for the purpose of reducing tidal velocities consists in the excavation of a channel in Harlem Kills, 480 feet wide and 24 feet deep, at an estimated cost of \$4,833,257, and a channel in Little Hell Gate 600 feet wide and 24 feet deep, at an estimated cost of \$6,148,629. The plan also contemplates the completion of a channel 400 feet wide and 26 feet deep between North and South Brother Islands and the construction of a channel 300 feet wide and 20 feet deep south of South Brother Island, estimated to cost \$215,000 and \$380,778, respectively. The total cost of the project proposed by the district officer is \$32,533,501. In view of the existing and future commerce of the port of New York and of the urgent need of a fuller utilization of the whole of its water front, he was of opinion that the East River is worthy of further improvement to the extent indicated above.

These reports have been referred, as required by law, to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and attention is invited to the board's accompanying report, dated July 16, 1913. Not being convinced that all the work recommended by the district officer would be justified at present, the board requested that certain revised estimates be secured. The board was not satisfied that the large expenditure proposed for current regulation would result in commensurate benefits, and as the problem of tidal changes at this locality is complex, it believed that it would be better to await the developments that might follow the construction of the Harlem Kills Channel to a depth of 18 feet, which has been recommended by the department but not yet adopted by Congress. The estimated cost of the work recommended by the board for the through 35-foot channel is \$8,616,780; for the work required to give access to the wharves, \$2,129,458; for channel east of Blackwells Island, \$1,877,000; and for other auxiliary work, \$775,281, making a total of \$13,389,519, or, in round numbers, \$13,400,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEWTOWN CREEK, N. Y.—NEW PROJECT.

Newtown Creek, N. Y.: For improvement of Newtown Creek and tributaries in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 936, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$150,000: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any lands required for the purpose of this improvement.

Mr. HULBERT. I now wish to insert Report of the Chief of Engineers, printed in House Document No. 936, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session:

Newtown Creek empties into East River at a point opposite Thirty-fourth Street, New York City. Dutch Kills, Maspeth Creek, and English Kills are short tributaries of Newtown Creek. The existing project, adopted by the act of June 3, 1896, provides for dredging a channel 18 feet deep at mean low water and 125 feet wide from the mouth to the head of navigation at the intersection of Metropolitan Avenue and Newtown Creek, or East Branch, and to the Metropolitan Avenue Bridge crossing English Kills, or West Branch. The project has been completed. To June 30, 1915, there had been expended on this and previous projects \$496,662.55. The mean range of tide is about 4½ feet. The district officer states that the only unusual difficulties of navigation are due to the density of the traffic and the narrowness of the stream.

The deepest draft vessels now using the creek in considerable numbers are the lumber schooners and barges, many of which draw 19 feet when fully loaded. At present such vessels are obliged to operate at or near high tide, at which time the channel is also used by scows destined for the tributary waters where the low-water depths are not sufficient to accommodate them. The commerce of the creek is large and valuable, averaging in recent years about 5,000,000 tons, valued at about \$200,000,000. In his report on the survey the district officer, who is also the division engineer, presents a comprehensive plan for further improvement of Newtown Creek and its tributary channels, with alternative estimates of cost for depths of 16, 18, and 20 feet, with an allowance of 2 feet for overdepth dredging in each case. He is of opinion that the locality is worthy of further improvement to the extent of providing a channel 20 feet deep at mean low water, 250 feet wide at the entrance, narrowing to 150 feet, and continuing with this width to Grand Street Bridge on the East Branch, and thence 125 feet wide to Metropolitan Avenue on said branch, including the removal of Mussel Island; 150 feet wide in English Kills, or West Branch, to the Metropolitan Avenue Bridge across said branch, including the easing of bends; 100 feet wide for a distance of 2,000 feet up Maspeth Creek, and 75 to 100 feet wide for a distance of 2,800 feet up Dutch Kills, with a turning basin at the head, all at an estimated cost of \$510,000, and \$18,000 annually for maintenance. He believes that the locality is worthy of further improvement to the extent indicated, subject to the condition that no work shall be done in Maspeth Creek until its harbor lines have been approved by the Secretary of War and all questions of right of way have been satisfactorily settled without expense to the United States; and that no work shall be done on removal of Mussel Island or on widening the channel above that island or in English Kills until the necessary rights of way have been provided in each case without cost to the United States and corresponding changes have been made in the existing harbor lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

HARLEM RIVER, N. Y.

Harlem River, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$250,000.

Mr. HULBERT. I now wish to add:

The Harlem River and Spuyten Duyvil Creek, both included in the project for improvement, are two tidal waterways of a joint length of about 8 miles, which join at Kingsbridge. They lie wholly within the limits of Greater New York, and separate Manhattan Island from the mainland. The East River entrance is about 8½ miles northeast of the Battery, New York City, and the Hudson River entrance about 13½ miles north of the Battery. The Harlem River also connects with the East River by way of Little Hell Gate, between Wards and Randalls Islands, and by way of Harlem (Bronx) Kills, between Randalls Island and the mainland. These channels are not used by navigators, being shoal, rocky, and winding, with strong tidal currents.

The existing project provides for a continuous channel 400 feet wide and 15 feet deep at mean low water from the East River to the Hudson River, except at Washington Bridge, where the adopted width is 354 feet, and at the rock cut through Dyckmans Meadow, where the adopted width is 350 feet and the depth 18 feet. It also provides for straightening the channel at Johnson Iron Works by making a cut at this point 400 feet wide and 15 feet deep at mean low water; estimated cost, \$3,550,000.

About 61 per cent of the work proposed under the existing project has been completed. The work done under all projects has resulted in making a channel 15 feet deep at mean low water and 400 feet wide from the East River to Putnam Railroad Bridge, except at a few points where the channel is somewhat narrowed by shoals, and at Macombs Dam Bridge, where the available depth is 12 feet in the westerly draw opening; the easterly one is not navigable, being obstructed by ledge rock (now in process of removal). From the Putnam Railroad Bridge to the Hudson River the channel is 15 feet deep and from about 150 to 350 feet wide. On June 30, 1916, the maximum available depth for navigation through the Harlem River is estimated at 15 feet at mean low water, except at Macombs Dam Bridge, where it is not more than 12 feet. The widths of

channel through bridge draws are 98 to 100 feet. At High Bridge the piers obstruct navigation and cause eddies and high current velocities which render navigation through the bridge channel hazardous; the horizontal clearance normal to the channel between these piers at elevation -5, mean low-water reference, is but about 44 feet. The expenditures under this project to June 30, 1916, amount to \$2,022,837.19—\$1,980,115.08 for new work, \$37,258.59 for maintenance, \$963.52 for maps, etc., for which the appropriation was reimbursed by receipts from sales and collections and \$4,500 was recovered on the bond of a failing contractor and credited to the appropriation.

To complete the improvement there remains to be done a considerable amount of dredging and rock excavation in several stretches of the river between Madison Avenue Bridge and the Hudson River.

The river and harbor act of June 18, 1878, adopting the existing project for this improvement, and the river and harbor act of March 3, 1879, provided that the necessary right of way should be provided free of cost to the United States before work was begun. This provision was complied with by the State of New York, which procured the necessary lands and completed their transfer to the United States in May, 1887. A similar provision is contained in the river and harbor act of March 4, 1913, authorizing the straightening of the channel at Johnson Iron Works. The river and harbor act of March 4, 1915, provides for the cession to the State of the land occupied by the present channel at that point after the right of way for the cut-off had been provided and the new channel completed. A description of the lands required, with map, has been furnished the State of New York. The prosecution of the work of straightening the channel is awaiting the transfer of these lands.

The funds available June 30, 1916, together with those appropriated by the river and harbor act of July 27, 1916, will be expended for rock removal in the easterly draw channel at Macombs Dam Bridge and for dredging and rock removal from Putnam Bridge to the vicinity of High Bridge. Work at Macombs Dam Bridge is now under way and should be completed in the spring of 1917. It is expected that work above Putnam Bridge will be commenced in the fall of 1916 and that the available funds will be exhausted about June 30, 1917.

It is proposed to expend the funds for which estimate is submitted in this report in continuing the improvement as follows:

For rock removal at Macombs Dam Bridge and in the vicinity of High Bridge.....	\$125,000
For dredging above High Bridge.....	125,000
	250,000

Ledge rock now obstructs the west-draw channel of Macombs Dam Bridge at a depth of 12 feet. This should be deepened to project depth as soon as the work now under way in the east channel is completed. The removal of the rock ledge in the west side of the channel at High Bridge is necessary to assist in relieving the constriction of the channel at this point. The dredging proposed is for the purpose of continuing the channel of project dimensions to above the mouth of Sherman Creek, at which point a State barge-canal terminal is to be located.

As a result of a careful canvass, the commerce of the Harlem River, mainly in general merchandise, coal, building materials, grain, etc., and ice, appears to be as follows:

Comparative statement.

Calendar year.	Short tons.	Value.	Passengers carried. ¹
1913.....	18,313,336	\$704,984,490
1914.....	11,577,922	582,383,737
1915.....	15,096,169	1,538,506,583	454,199

¹ None reported in 1913 or 1914 returns.

Five vessels built and launched in 1915; value, \$59,500.

The reduction in the amount of commerce carried on the Harlem River in 1914 below that of previous years is due mainly to removal of a large lumber yard to the East River and an unexplained reduction in the coal tonnage.

Amount expended on all projects from June 18, 1878, to June 30, 1916:	
New work	\$2,006,578.60
Maintenance	37,258.59
Total	2,043,837.19
Balance available for fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.....	274,191.47
Amount (estimated) required to be appropriated for completion of existing project.....	1,290,258.59
Amount that can be profitably expended in fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, for works of improvement.....	250,000.00

The Clerk read as follows:

Absecon Inlet, N. J.: For maintenance, \$45,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 12 and 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, lines 12 and 13, strike out the item.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, Absecon Inlet project has received \$300,000 and it has a balance of \$43,958 on hand. This item calls for \$45,000 more. The depth is 12 feet and is to be 300 feet wide after the project is completed. The commerce in 1915 reached 5,237 tons. The appropriation of 1913 was conditional on the contribution of the locality. The engineers allowed \$45,000 unconditionally in 1915. There is a controversy in regard to the authority of the engineers to have made that allotment, but I am not raising that question at this time. What I do say, gentlemen, is that it will cost \$45,000 annually to keep that place dredged, whereas the commerce last year was only 5,237 tons. It is one of the newer projects. I believe it is a waste of money and that the item ought to be stricken from the bill or the amount considerably reduced.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment. Absecon Inlet is an inlet at the upper end of Atlantic City, N. J. It is known to the people of the United States fully as well as any inlet in this country. It has a harbor for innumerable vessels, many of them of the smaller type, and by virtue of the improvement already made by the Government at this point some steamships have undertaken to do business from Atlantic City direct to New York.

It costs a great deal of money to get commodities to Atlantic City, where the people of the world congregate during the summer time. The trains are congested, and the ocean is available to bring in the heavy freight. A steamship line has been employed now for several years, on promise of an improvement in the channel at Atlantic City, making communication with New York on the outside and with Philadelphia around the other way. It has made a brave effort to keep up these communications.

Absecon Inlet has been the scene of some of the frightful disasters, involving the loss of life, and of some heroic life-saving scenes as well. Atlantic City has pleaded, as has the State of New Jersey—and the people who have come from other States have been witnesses to the pleading—for an improved channel at that point. Shifting sands out in the ocean and varying currents, from time to time, have made perilous the voyages of hundreds of small vessels carrying hundreds of thousands of people from Atlantic City out to the sea every year. Indeed, it seems that if there is one item in this bill that is meritorious this item for improving the inlet at Atlantic City is that item. It involves human life as well as commerce, and the improvement thus far made, and which no State could make because it has to be made out in the ocean itself, has resulted in general good. Not only has it afforded an improved service to passengers who wanted to get out to the fishing banks in the ocean in the summer time, or to get a little of the fresh ozone of the great Atlantic, but it has given inspiration to the men who had capital to invest and who, upon assurance that this work of the Government would go on, were willing to make the investment. If we are to have progress, this amendment will not pass.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Did not the mayor and the committee from Atlantic City contend that this regulated the traffic rates?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why, it has helped rates immensely, and it has given an assurance of safety to the lives of thousands of people who come, not from New Jersey or Atlantic City only but from every State in this Union.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FERRIS). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Raccoon Creek, N. J.: For maintenance, \$5,000; completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 800, Sixty-third Congress, second session, \$39,770; in all, \$44,770.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all of the paragraph excepting that which refers to maintenance.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 24, strike out all of line 24, and lines 1 and 2 on page 8.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this is another new project, but let me say in regard to the last project it proves that the Government is paying about \$9 a ton annually to carry 5,000 tons of commerce. I do not suppose that any of these items will be stricken out after presenting a case of that kind without result. There is nothing, so far as I know, in the hearings before the committee or in the reports that indicated the great danger the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] so pleadingly speaks of.

However, that has been determined, and we now come to Raccoon Creek, which I believe is another project up in that same section.

Mr. BROWNING. It is nowhere near it.

Mr. FREAR. There is a balance on hand of \$5,643, and the bill asks for a maintenance of \$5,000. The present project has been 95 per cent completed. The engineer's report says that the remaining portion of that project is unnecessary. In 1915 there were no operations whatsoever, but \$543 was spent for office expenses. There is a small commerce there. It is a new project which is proposed in addition to the old.

Mr. BROWNING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. BROWNING. What do you call a small commerce?

Mr. FREAR. A project on which we have spent about \$190,000, and on which there was carried 69,000 tons of commerce, of which 35,000 tons is manure, does not sound very large, with only four power boats on the project, according to the engineer's report.

Mr. BROWNING. The engineers do not report that there are only four power boats on the project.

Mr. FREAR. That is from the 1916 report. I am now reading from page 5 of House Document No. 800, Sixty-third Congress.

The traffic of the stream is carried by gasoline boats and barges, by one steamboat plying daily between Bridgeport and Philadelphia, and by occasional steam tugs with barges.

That report was back in 1913. It says further:

A greater width at bottom than 40 feet will be impracticable, without endangering the stability of the banks, but this width will accommodate the existing traffic and permit a substantial increase.

In other words, the Government will not be able to improve this stream beyond 40 feet in width without endangering the banks, which will cave in. So that is the extent of the river in width. It is large enough for present needs.

A short distance below Swedesboro is a highway bridge, shown in detail on the map, which requires proper approaches in the stream and the clearing out of obstructing shoals in one draw opening.

The stream is tortuous in its course, but can not be advantageously straightened by cutting off points or shortened by making cut-offs, because the meadows along the banks have been protected by levees and have been reclaimed to a greater extent than on any other stream in the district. Instead of worthless marsh lands, usually acquired for cut-offs, valuable farm lands would be destroyed, and the price would be out of proportion to the benefits expected.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there is a maintenance offered on this item, and we have been making appropriations regularly, and that the engineers say that the remaining portion of the original project is wholly unnecessary, that it is only 40 feet wide, all indicates that there is no imperative necessity for this appropriation at this time. I move that it be stricken out.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I think if the gentleman would examine the statistics of Raccoon Creek he would not make the remarks he has just made. Raccoon Creek is a stream of more than 10 miles in length. Swedesboro is situated near the head of this stream, and from that point more farm produce is shipped than from any other point in the State of New Jersey. There is no stream that empties into the Delaware River that carries as much tonnage as does Raccoon Creek, with one exception, Christiana Creek, at Wilmington. Nearly all of the early tomatoes and sweet potatoes that are shipped from Swedesboro to Baltimore and Philadelphia are carried on this stream. That carried to Boston and to New York is shipped by rail. In 1914 34 vessels were regularly employed on Raccoon Creek, using 21 landings and wharves, and handling a commerce amounting to about 92,000 tons. Since that time this commerce has increased, and a large part of the traffic is carried on at the Swedesboro wharves, and it is very necessary that the water be increased to a depth of 7 feet up to that point.

The estimated cost of this proposed improvement is \$39,770, with about \$5,000 annually for maintenance. This estimate is about \$4,400 more than the unappropriated balance for the existing project. The full amount of the estimate, \$39,770, should be made available in one appropriation, as pointed out by the Board of Engineers.

And right here, Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote from the report of Maj. R. R. Raymond, engineer in charge, made on May 14, 1913:

He says:

The traffic of the stream is carried by gasoline boats and barges, by one steamboat plying daily between Bridgeport and Philadelphia, and by occasional steam tugs with barges. Mr. Miller reports 34 vessels regularly employed, with an aggregate tonnage of 4,823, and draft between 4 and 6 feet. In 1912 the commerce amounted to 92,888 short tons, valued at \$1,163,700. About 21 landings and wharves are used. The incoming freight consists principally of fertilizer, coal, building and road materials, and domestic commodities. The outgoing freight is farm produce, fruits, and truck. Vegetables are shipped in large quantities by rail to Boston and other eastern cities, and by boat to Philadelphia, Chester, and other places on the Delaware River. For shipments of this kind Raccoon Creek ranks near the head of the list of tributaries of the Delaware River and Bay. The heaviest receipts and shipments are made at the wharves at Swedesboro.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have quoted from the report of Maj. Raymond. This project is deserving, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment. Supplementing the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING], I wish to say that when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] was on his feet, berating this item of Raccoon Creek—and I say this in all kindness—he had in his hand the report of 1913. He referred to a few cargoes of manure that were carried on this river, but he stopped his reading after he had called up a few gasoline boats and a few barges plying between Bridgeport and Philadelphia.

Now, the gentleman had before him the additional information that was just read by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING], showing what the incoming freight was and what the outgoing freight was. I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin meant to read only a portion of that report, but I do say that the reading of only a portion of a report and the omission of the meat of it is misleading and unfair when we are endeavoring to discuss the merits of a project like this. I refer to the report of the engineer, dated May 14, 1913, from Wilmington, Del.

Now, the principal objection to Raccoon Creek, in this discussion at least, is its name. There is no reason for opposing Raccoon Creek except that the name does not strike the "fawncy" of some of the men who like to criticize, and, of course, in so emphasizing the word I do not refer to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], who is a plain-spoken citizen. The trouble with the great editors is we call it "Raccoon Creek," and if we were to call it "Goose Creek" it would be the same.

Mr. FREAR. Goose Creek does not get anything. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It may be worthy, but I say it is not fair to strike out an item simply because the name does not strike us favorably. The truth is, as shown by the statistics produced by my friend from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING], that Raccoon Creek is one of the liveliest tributaries of the Delaware River.

What goes into Raccoon Creek from these towns of Bridgeport and Swedesboro? Productions from the large cities. Where do they come from? From as far east as Boston, as indicated by the report of the engineer. The people of these towns have to buy something, and there are 21 landings along Raccoon Creek, where the steamers stop to deliver the commodities to the people who live there. That is business.

Now, what goes out of Raccoon Creek? The report indicates farm produce, fruits, and truck. And let me say there is no better farming land in this country than the farm land along Raccoon Creek. That section of New Jersey is prolific in what we call "small truck," and the vessels are coming and going constantly to carry the produce of the farmer—who, I hope, has a few friends left in this House besides myself. [Laughter.] We carry the products of the farmer out of Raccoon Creek to the people of New York and to the people of Boston, and I dare say in the form of canned goods they get even as far as Wisconsin, and—

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And beans. [Laughter.]

Mr. TREADWAY. We have other products in commerce besides beans. The inquiry I was going to propound to the gentleman was if it were not a new turn for the gentleman to be commenting favorably upon the interest of the farmer? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts I am one of the best friends of the farmer in this House. [Laughter.] I have stood here in behalf of the farmer through thick and thin, when some men

who shouted a great deal louder about the farmer were not as sincerely interested in him as I was.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. Does not the gentleman think the stream would be more popular if it were named "Browning River?"

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would be deserving, but "Raccoon Creek" is an honored name in New Jersey. The point I wanted to make for the benefit of my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], who means well, is that if we would improve the large rivers and the large cities we must pay attention to the small rivers and to the small cities, where the raw products come from; and unless these people who ship their goods from 21 landings along Raccoon Creek have the means to get out to the rest of the world, then we close up their opportunities and we increase the cost of living to the people in the large cities. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. In view of some of the criticisms just made against Raccoon Creek, and those that may be made against other creeks mentioned in this bill, I rise for the purpose of submitting a statement which I have here of the different creeks for which provision is made in the bill. I find 16 of them in all, with appropriations amounting only to \$330,170. These creeks, embracing all that are in the bill, accommodate a tonnage of 7,114,202 tons, valued at \$169,931,000. The statement should be of interest to both friends and opponents of this class of legislation. I ask unanimous consent to print this with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the memorandum referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Creeks in 1917 bill.

Creeks.	Total appropriation.	Appropriation in this bill.	Commerce.	
			Tons.	Value.
East Chester Creek, N. Y.	\$210,500	\$11,000	139,798	\$776,331
Westchester Creek, N. Y.	97,280	58,000	220,912	498,393
Newtown Creek, N. Y.	535,900	150,000	5,756,102	147,086,860
Woodbridge Creek, N. J.	97,750	3,000	67,610	305,740
Woodbury Creek, N. J.	46,500	2,000	11,270	38,390
Raccoon Creek, N. J.	92,500	44,770	89,638	844,290
Oldmans Creek, N. J.	38,000	5,000	60,438	423,875
Alloway Creek, N. J.	50,500	2,000	19,343	939,915
Tuckerton Creek, N. J.	83,380	5,000	21,997	991,920
Tyaskin Creek, Md.	36,836	5,800	6,634	194,440
Newbegun Creek, N. C.	None.	5,000	5,000	300,000
Contentinis Creek, N. C.	85,000	1,000	9,607	146,975
Fancy Bluff Creek, Ga.	10,000	1,000	2,513	84,882
Petaluma Creek, Cal.	181,593	7,500	895,311	17,571,314
San Rafael Creek, Cal.	None.	27,300	37,900
Skamokawa Creek, Wash.	None.	1,800	1,341
Total.....	814,773	330,170	7,114,202	169,931,041

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Oldmans Creek, N. J.: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out this paragraph. The statistics in regard to Oldmans Creek show that a small appropriation of \$38,000 has been made. I am trying to ascertain the necessity, if it exists, for these various appropriations which occur in this bill. A balance of \$5,647 is on hand. The sum of \$5,000 is asked for in this bill. If the doctrine of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], which has suddenly been suggested to the committee, is to be carried out, then all these creeks require appropriations. Those who are closest to the farmer forget that when the public-building bill for \$38,000,000 was before the House a few days ago, the same gentleman supported that bill, and the farmers did not come out very well on that, because that was for cities, towns, and villages, and the farmers were not considered. All they had was the to the farmer forget that when the public-buildings bill for \$38,000,000. According to the report of the engineers, Oldmans Creek is crooked and obstructed by sharp bends and shallows. As I said, we have appropriated \$38,000. In 1915 there were no operations, but \$1,089 for office expenses. Will the chairman of the committee kindly explain to me why they spent over \$1,000 for office expenses with no improvement to the creek that year? Is there any information about that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say to the gentleman that I have no specific information in regard to this particular item, but that it is customary to charge the office expenses to the appropriation.

Mr. FREAR. Where is the office that would carry that appropriation of \$1,000 and over?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think at Philadelphia.

Mr. BROWNING. Wilmington.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey corrects me and states that it is at Wilmington.

Mr. FREAR. It seems to me it is entirely unfair and unreasonable for the engineers to charge \$1,089 for office expenses when there was no operation on the stream. I can understand that when an improvement is going on there may be office expenses; but when there is no improvement, why should there be office expenses? The same thing is true of many of these other projects.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Did the gentleman make any effort at the Engineer's Office to find out what the expenses were?

Mr. FREAR. No; but I asked the engineer before the committee, and he could not give any explanation, except that they usually charged 10 per cent. There is no 10 per cent here, because not a dollar was expended on the project, but \$1,089 was charged for office expenses. I speak of this because two or three days ago we spent an hour here on the floor of the House discussing a \$300 item. Here is a \$5,000 item, and \$1,089 was expended last year for office expenses when there were no operations on the stream.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman asked the engineer about it—and I do not doubt that he did—certainly the engineer must have misunderstood his question, or he could have answered it.

Mr. FREAR. I did not complain about his answer. I thought it a very proper answer where there were improvements going on; but here is a charge for office expenses with nothing being done on the stream. The Army Engineers further report that this stream has small commerce; that all wharves are private, subject to charge. The statistics were furnished by some firm that is there. I can not believe that \$5,000 is really needed in addition to the \$5,647 on hand, when we spent nothing last year except for office expenses.

I move to strike out the item.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to reply to a statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] in regard to the item of \$1,089. It would have been perfectly easy for the gentleman to discover what that was for if he had wanted to do so. A letter addressed to the Chief of Engineers would have brought him a detailed statement. He had plenty of time to get it. It occurs to me that if I was anxious for information I would seek it at the place where it could be obtained rather than wait to ask upon the floor of the House, in order to see if I could puzzle some one having the bill in charge by asking the question.

Mr. FREAR. I do not want to puzzle anybody.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In other words, it seems to me if a man is really desirous of information he will go where he knows he can get it.

Mr. FREAR. I have been charged with not attending the meetings of the committee, and while I have been working very hard on this matter here is something that I noted, a charge of \$1,089 with no improvements on the river, and it seemed to me that I asked a very reasonable and proper question about something concerning which I wished to be informed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman's observation as a general proposition would be correct. But he says that he asked the engineer himself, and the engineer said he usually charged 10 per cent. That put him on his guard; it passed out of the usual condition, and if there was anything wrong about it, or if there was not anything wrong about it and he was interested in it he was put on his guard, and it having been brought to his attention a letter which he could have dictated in five minutes, addressed to the Chief of Engineers, would have given him all the information called for.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to answer the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin as to what the \$1,089 was spent for. Oldmans Creek is in my district. It is the dividing line between Gloucester and Salem Counties. There were improvements made on the creek some years ago—I think in 1912-13. The stream was a very crooked one, and there was a large tract of land contributed to the Government to straighten it, and it was straightened. There has been nothing asked for improvement, although I do not think the whole subject has been completed. This \$5,000 is only for maintenance, which must be appropriated to keep up the improvement already made. It would be foolish for the Government to spend its money and

then not maintain the depth of water. It is a creek used entirely by the farmers; the farm products go out and what the farmers buy is shipped in.

Mr. FREAR. But there is a balance of \$5,647 on hand.

Mr. BROWNING. That can not be used for maintenance. The engineers know better than I do why the \$5,000 is required. I do not think they would recommend it if it was not necessary. I hope the item will remain in the bill.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says that there was expended during the last fiscal year \$1,089.09 for office expenses, and he asked the chairman of the committee to explain the items in that expenditure. I assume that the purpose of that question is to discredit the engineers. He was drawing the inference that the expenditure was unauthorized or discreditable to the engineer.

Now, there are only two references that I find in the engineer's report. One on page 373, under the paragraph of operations and results during the fiscal year, and then follows this language:

No operations in progress; expenditures were for office expenses and inspection, amounting to \$1,089.09 for maintenance.

Then, on page 374, under the head "Amount expended during the fiscal year for maintenance of improvement, is the same item, \$1,089.09. So it appears from the report of the Chief of Engineers, which are the only references in the report to the matter which the gentleman from Wisconsin called for, is that of its office expenses and inspection for the maintenance of the project. I take it that that answers the question.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have heard a good deal in the debate on this bill and on the public-buildings bill about "steal," "robbery," and so forth. I would like to ask whether or not there are projects in this bill now before the committee that are not favorably reported upon by the Army engineers?

Mr. SMALL. Not one.

Mr. SAUNDERS. So that if there are any steals in the bill, they are commended by the Army engineers?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. SAUNDERS. And there has been some suggestion to turn over a lump sum to be expended by these very Army engineers?

Mr. SMALL. That is true.

Mr. SAUNDERS. And now that we are following their judgment in respect to this particular bill, we are denounced as being abettors of that steal?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman from Wisconsin is attempting to discredit the engineers with whom he proposes to place a lump-sum appropriation. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alloway Creek, N. J.: For maintenance, \$2,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do that in order that I may make some explanation in regard to the question just put by the gentleman from Virginia to the gentleman from North Carolina. I have not said that this was a steal. I know that a distinguished Democrat at the other end of the Capitol once called it a humbug and a steal.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I did not use his name in connection with that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield just a moment, I think the gentleman's language in reference to the distinguished Democrat at the other end of the Capitol might be misunderstood. He did not refer to this bill as a steal.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no; that is true; it was a former river and harbor bill. Now, in reference to the Army engineers, I have said that there is no doubt that on many projects there is much waste. I never claimed it to be a steal, but you can not get a single item out of the bill—the upper Mississippi, the lower Mississippi, or the Missouri—in order to limit the total amount of expenditures, and thereby reduce the amount of the waste. The only way is to do as we did two or three years ago—limit the total amount and place it in the hands of the Army engineers and make them responsible for the use of the money. I did not believe that the way they apportioned the money the last time was right, but I do not see how you can otherwise reduce the total amount of the bill.

Mr. HULBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. In the speech which the gentleman made last year, did he not very severely criticize the Army engineers for the manner in which they made the allotments?

Mr. FREAR. Why, I did, or certainly ought to have done so; but we can not get any reduction except to reduce the total amount. I do not think their allotment was any better than that of the committee, so far as it went, but there was less waste because there was less money to spend.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Then, I gather that the criticism that appears in the newspapers and on the part of various critics in the House of Representatives to the effect that this bill is a steal is not well taken, is not justified by the facts.

Mr. FREAR. I do not know what the gentleman is referring to. Of course, I can answer only for myself and not for others.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman can answer whether or not in his judgment those epithets which have been freely used in connection with this bill are justified.

Mr. FREAR. I have not seen those epithets.

Mr. SAUNDERS. An editorial appearing in one of these northern papers the other day was to that effect.

Mr. FREAR. I will say this, that I think it is full of waste.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Then this becomes a matter of judgment.

Mr. FREAR. Surely. That is all our legislation results from, anyway.

Mr. SAUNDERS. And the committee is backed in their judgment by the judgment of these Army engineers.

Mr. FREAR. Unquestionably so; and, referring to the gentleman from North Carolina, who is complaining about the amount used for office expenses, they appropriated over \$230,000 for office expenses and inspection in one appropriation.

Mr. SAUNDERS. It is suggested to me by my colleague on my right, the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. GALLAGHER], that in addition to the House having the confirmatory judgment of these engineers, it also has the judgment of the Secretary of War.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; but the Secretary of War follows the judgment of the Army engineers. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not stand alone in this. One hundred and forty Members of the House held the same belief at the last session, and the bill was passed in the Senate by only 1 vote. I am not standing alone in this proposition. Every gentleman who has a project here believes that the bill ought to go through; but I do not believe the bill is above criticism, and I am endeavoring to criticize it fairly.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pittsburgh Harbor, Pa.: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Mr. NORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose at this time of extending my remarks in the Record upon this bill by having printed therein the report of the Chief of Engineers of 1916, respecting the rivers and harbors of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) district, and some personal correspondence relative to the improvement of the Allegheny River.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner stated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

REPORT OF CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY, 1916, RIVERS AND HARBORS, PITTSBURGH (PA.) DISTRICT, AND CORRESPONDENCE OF HON. S. TAYLOR NORTH RELATIVE TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE ALLEGHENY RIVER DURING THE SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS.

3. ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA.—OPEN-CHANNEL WORK.

Location and description: The Allegheny River rises in northern Pennsylvania, flows northwestward into New York, and thence southward to Pittsburgh, Pa., where it joins with the Monongahela River to form the Ohio. Its length is 325 miles. (See U. S. Geological Survey charts for Pennsylvania and New York, unnumbered.) The drainage area is 11,580 square miles, low-water discharge 1,440 cubic feet per second, and highest measured discharge 286,834 cubic feet per second. High or low water may occur at any time, but most of the freshets come in the late winter and spring. The river is nontidal and the current rapid. The average fall per mile of navigable portion—i. e. from Olean, N. Y., to the mouth, is 2.2 feet. The average width varies gradually from 225 feet at Olean to 1,060 at the mouth.

Original condition: The river originally contained obstructive bowlders, snags, islands, bars, and shoals, making navigation hazardous and practicable only at the highest stages. The channel width was extremely variable. The minimum, safe, usable low-water depth was about 3 feet. Rafting, logging, and light steamboating extended from Olean, N. Y., to Pittsburgh, Pa., a distance of 255 miles.

Previous projects: None.

Existing project: This project was adopted by the river and harbor act of March 3, 1879, which contemplated the removal of bowlders and snags and the construction of low dams and dikes to close secondary channels and concentrate the low-water flow on the shoals between French Creek and the mouth, 126 miles. The approved estimate of cost of the original work was \$51,425. (H. Ex. Doc. No. 21, 46th Cong., 3d sess., and reprinted in Annual Report for 1879, p. 1371.) The project was extended by the river and harbor act of August 2, 1882, to include similar improvements from French Creek to the New York State line, 88 miles. The approved estimate of cost of original work

from French Creek to Olean, N. Y., 129 miles, was \$40,000. (S. Ex. Doc. No. 89, 46th Cong., 2d sess.) The total length of section included in the project from the mouth to New York State line is 214 miles. A well-defined navigable channel from 150 feet wide and about 1 foot deep, at low water at the New York State line to 300 feet wide and approximately 2 feet deep at low water at the head of Pool No. 3, at Natrona, Pa., 25 miles above the mouth, has been established by the removal of all obstructive bowlders and snags and the construction of 10 low dams and dikes. For locks and dams contemplated see report on construction of locks and dams. The only published map of the Allegheny River appears in House Document No. 740, Sixty-third Congress, second session, page 1002. No estimate for maintenance was ever made.

Operations and results during the fiscal year: No work of construction was performed. Inspections were made of work being done under department permits and to prevent channel encroachments. The inspection expenditures amounted to \$584.07 and were charged to maintenance.

Condition at the end of fiscal year: Ten low dams and dikes to close secondary channels and concentrate the low-water flow on shoals were completed by 1898. These regulating works, although needing repairs, still perform their functions. All rock and snag obstructions were removed from New York State line to mouth, 214 miles, by 1904. A mill-dam at Corydon was modified in 1887 and entirely removed in 1910. No further new work is contemplated. The work done permits safe navigation at stages from 2 to 3 feet lower than formerly. The navigable depth varies gradually with location and greatly according to seasonal conditions. Slack-water improvement from Natrona, Pa., to the mouth has reduced the open-channel distance by 24 miles. The total expenditure for original work was \$197,000 and for maintenance \$73,883.61, a total of \$270,883.61.

Local cooperation: None.

Effect of improvement: Water transportation has been rendered easier and safer. Whether the improvement has caused reduction in freight rates or prevented their increase is not known. Rail rates are much higher than actual cost of water transportation. For similar commodities railroad freight rates are considerably higher in the Allegheny Valley than in the Monongahela where the river is well improved for upward of 130 miles. This condition is believed to exist largely because of the limited slack-water improvement completed on the Allegheny and the restrictions upon navigation due to the obstructive bridges at the mouth, which together prevent the full utilization of this waterway.

Proposed operations: It is proposed to use the funds which are shown as available for the year ending June 30, 1917, as follows:

To reconstructing the stone-filled and paved cribwork dike at Red Bank across a gap 118 feet wide by 7.5 feet in height, a second gap 225 feet wide by 5 feet in height, 600 linear feet of top cribwork 3 feet in height with stone filling and paving, and renewing sundry timbers, stone filling, and paving on other parts of dike.....	\$11,000.00
To recovering and replacing in a 580-foot gap in the dam at Nicholson's Island, 1,200 cubic yards of old and 600 cubic yards of new stone.....	2,500.00
To minor repairs to other dikes and dams and channel in general and contingencies.....	2,240.91
Total.....	15,740.91

It is expected that about one-third of the funds available, \$15,740.91, will be used in October and November, 1916, and the remainder from May to October, 1917, at the rate of about \$2,100 per month. No additional appropriation for the year ending June 30, 1918, is recommended.

Commercial statistics: There is given below a comparative statement of the commerce on the open river above slack water which consisted principally of sand, gravel, and dredged waste material. For 1915 the tonnage was distributed among these classes as follows: Sand, 61 per cent; gravel, 31 per cent; dredged waste material, 7 per cent; leaving 1 per cent for miscellaneous items. The usual limit of draft for this commerce is about 4 feet. During the year 7 towboats and 10 sand-and-gravel dredges were operated.

Comparative statement.

Calendar year.	Short tons.	Value.
1913.....	43,558	\$196,954
1914.....	108,092	202,673
1915.....	278,870	227,434

Financial summary.

Amount expended on all projects to June 30, 1916:	
New work.....	\$197,000.00
Maintenance.....	73,883.61
Total.....	270,883.61

Amount expended during fiscal year ending June 30.	1914	1915	1916
New work.....			
Maintenance.....	\$1,226.03	\$986.34	\$584.07

APPROPRIATIONS.

[For last five fiscal years only.]

Mar. 4, 1913.....	\$2,000.00
July 27, 1916.....	15,000.00
July 1, 1915, balance unexpended.....	1,324.98
June 30, 1916, amount expended during fiscal year for maintenance of improvement.....	584.07
July 1, 1916, balance unexpended.....	740.91
Amount appropriated by river and harbor act approved July 27, 1916.....	15,000.00
Balance available for fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.....	15,740.91

4. ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA., CONSTRUCTION OF LOCKS AND DAMS.

Location and description and original condition: See report on Allegheny River, Pa., open-channel improvement.

Previous projects: None.

Existing project: The existing canalization project extends from the mouth to Rimerton, Pa., 61 miles, and contemplates the construction of eight locks and dams as follows:

Lock and Dam No. 1 by the river and harbor act of August 5, 1886; Locks and Dams Nos. 2 and 3 by the river and harbor act of June 3, 1896; and Locks and Dams Nos. 4 to 8, inclusive, by the river and harbor act of July 25, 1912, appropriating \$300,000, provided that local interests contribute an equal amount, as modified by the river and harbor act of March 4, 1913, revoking above condition and reappropriating \$300,000, provided—

“that no part of said amount shall be expended until the Secretary of War shall have received satisfactory assurances that the channel spans of the bridges forming unreasonable obstructions to the navigation of the Allegheny River at Pittsburgh will be modified as recommended by a board of engineer officers in a report dated November 23, 1910.”

The estimate of cost of original work was \$3,888,000. (Annual Reports 1891, p. 2366; 1896, p. 2214; and H. Doc. No. 540, 62d Cong., 2d sess.)

The purpose of the construction of Locks and Dams Nos. 1 to 8, inclusive, is to provide a least slack-water depth of 7 feet at normal level of the pools. This has been accomplished in completed Locks 1, 2, and 3 for widths varying from about 200 feet at the narrowest shoals to approximately 800 feet at the widest natural pools, except that at the head of Fourteen Mile Island the navigable depth is only 6.5 feet at the normal level of pool No. 2. When movable Dams Nos. 1, Allegheny and Ohio Rivers, are down the open-channel depth below Lock No. 2 is occasionally reduced during low-water periods to 4 feet. The only published map of the Allegheny River appears in House Document No. 740, Sixty-third Congress, second session, page 1002.

Dam No.	Location.		Lock dimensions		Lift at normal pool stage.	Depth on miter sills at normal pool.	
	Miles above mouth.	Nearest town or other reference.	Clear width.	Length between miter sills.		Lower sill.	Upper sill.
1.....	1.7	Pittsburgh, Pa.....	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.
2.....	7.0	Aspinwall, Pa.....	55	330.0	7.0	8.0	15.0
3.....	17.0	Springdale, Pa.....	56	332.0	11.0	11.0	10.0
4.....	24.0	Natrona, Pa.....	56	330.0	10.5	7.0	6.5
5.....	31.6	Murphys Island, Pa.....	56	399.4	12.0	8.0	8.0
6.....	37.0	Clinton, Pa.....	56	399.4	12.0	8.0	8.0
7.....	46.0	Kittanning, Pa.....	56	399.4	13.0	8.0	8.0
8.....	53.3	Mosgrove, Pa.....	56	399.4	15.0	8.0	8.0

Dam No.	Character of foundation.		Kind of dam.	Type of construction.		Estimated cost.
	Lock.	Dam.		Lock.	Dam.	
1.....	Gravel	Gravel	Movable	Concrete	Chanoine wicket	\$600,000
2.....	Rock	do	Fixed	do	Concrete	500,000
3.....	Hardpan	do	do	do	Timber crib	
4.....	Rock	do	do	do	Concrete	483,000
5.....	Gravel	do	do	do	do	590,000
6.....	do	do	do	do	do	619,000
7.....	do	do	do	do	do	580,000
8.....	Rock	do	do	do	do	526,000

NOTE.—Data for Locks and Dams Nos. 4 to 8 inclusive, are tentative.

Operations and results during the fiscal year: No work was done. Condition at end of fiscal year: Lock and Dam No. 1 were completed in December, 1902, at a cost of \$594,373.07; Lock and Dam No. 2 in October, 1908, at a cost of \$544,947.90; and Lock and Dam No. 3 in December, 1904, at a cost of \$315,103.36. These dams furnish slack water from the mouth to Natrona, Pa., 24 miles. The minimum available depth at normal pool stage is 6.5 on a bar in Pool No. 2. Available drafts usually vary from 6 to 7 feet from March to December to 4 to 7 feet during the winter months. The lower limits above stated occur in Pool No. 1 when the movable dam is down on account of danger from ice. Locks and Dams Nos. 4 to 8, inclusive, intended to extend slack water from Natrona, Pa., to Rimerton, Pa., 37 miles, remain to be built. In January, 1907, the abutment of Dam No. 3 failed and a portion of the dam was blown out. These parts were restored at a cost of \$238,682.57. To the beginning of the fiscal year there was expended for new work \$1,454,424.33, and for maintenance \$238,815.07, a total of \$1,693,239.40.

Local cooperation: No special conditions were imposed by law, nor was there any local cooperation in the building of Locks and Dams Nos. 1, 2, and 3. As regards Locks and Dams Nos. 4 to 8, the river and harbor act of March 4, 1913, imposed the condition that no part of the funds appropriated for their construction is to be expended until the Secretary of War shall have received satisfactory assurance that the channel spans of the bridges forming unreasonable obstructions to the navigation of the Allegheny at Pittsburgh will be modified. Such assurance has not been received.

Effect of improvement: Safe navigation for drafts of 4 to 7 feet during fully 75 per cent of the year has been established from the mouth to Natrona, Pa. No noticeable reduction in freight rates has occurred, nor will likely occur until additional locks and dams are completed and obstructive bridges at Pittsburgh are modified. Rail rates are much higher than actual cost of present water shipments.

Proposed operations: Pending the fulfillment of the conditions imposed by Congress precedent to the commencement of work on Locks and Dams Nos. 4 to 8, no work is planned for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and no estimate of funds submitted for the year following.

Recommended modifications of project: None.

Commercial statistics: There is given below a comparative statement of the commerce on the slack-water portion of the river from Natrona to the mouth, consisting principally of coal, sand, gravel, steel billets, and dredged waste material. For 1915 the tonnage was distributed among these classes as follows: Coal, 39.9 per cent; sand and gravel, 49.1 per cent; steel billets, 6.8 per cent; and dredged waste material, 3.5 per cent. The usual limits of draft for this commerce are 6 to 8½ feet for coal and steel and 4 to 7½ feet for sand and gravel. During the year 16 towboats and 12 sand dredges were operated.

Comparative statement.

Calendar year.	Short tons.	Value.
1913.....	2,133,051	\$5,238,491
1914.....	1,838,593	4,191,213
1915.....	1,999,654	5,086,143

Financial summary.

LOCKS AND DAMS NOS. 1, 2, AND 3.

Amount expended on all projects to June 30, 1916:	
New work.....	\$1,454,424.33
Maintenance.....	238,815.07
Total.....	1,693,239.40

Amount expended during fiscal year ending June 30.	1914	1915	1916
New work.....			
Maintenance.....	\$2,446.70	\$132.50	

APPROPRIATIONS.

[For last five fiscal years only.]

None.

July 1, 1915, balance unexpended.....	\$19,424.93
July 1, 1916, balance unexpended.....	19,424.93
July 1, 1916, outstanding liabilities.....	\$60.80
July 1, 1916, amount covered by uncompleted contracts.....	825.00
July 1, 1916, balance available.....	18,539.13

LOCKS AND DAMS NOS. 4 AND 6.

Amount expended on all projects to June 30, 1916:	
New work.....	
Maintenance.....	

Amount expended during fiscal year ending June 30.	1914	1915	1916
New work.....			
Maintenance.....			

APPROPRIATIONS.

[For last five fiscal years only.]

Mar. 4, 1913.....	\$300,000.00
July 1, 1915, balance unexpended.....	300,000.00
July 1, 1916, balance unexpended.....	300,000.00
Amount (estimated) required to be appropriated for completion of existing project (exclusive of the balance unexpended July 1, 1916).....	2,488,000.00

CONSOLIDATED.

Amount expended on all projects to June 30, 1916:	
New work.....	1,454,424.33
Maintenance.....	238,815.07
Total.....	1,693,239.40

Amount expended during fiscal year ending June 30.	1914	1915	1916
New work.....			
Maintenance.....	\$2,446.70	\$132.50	

APPROPRIATIONS.

[For last five fiscal years only.]

Mar. 4, 1913.....	\$300,000.00
July 1, 1915, balance unexpended.....	319,424.93
July 1, 1916, balance unexpended.....	319,424.93
July 1, 1916, outstanding liabilities.....	\$60.80
July 1, 1916, amount covered by uncompleted contracts.....	825.00
July 1, 1916, balance available.....	318,539.13

Amount (estimated) required to be appropriated for completion of existing project (exclusive of the balance unexpended July 1, 1916)..... 2,488,000.00

5. OPERATING AND CARE OF LOCKS AND DAMS, ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA.

The improvement for which report is made under this caption forms part of the project for Allegheny River, Pa., construction of locks and dams, for which report is made on pages 1226 to 1229 of this report,

where general information regarding the improvement can be found. The work carried on is the operation and maintenance of the locks and dams reported on page 1227 as completed. These locks and dams have been operated and maintained under the permanent indefinite appropriation as follows: No. 1, since January 1, 1903; No. 2, since November 10, 1906; and No. 3, since November 29, 1904.

Operations and results during the fiscal year: The locks and dams were maintained in good condition and operated as occasion required. Repairs of minor importance to the structures and operating plants were made by hired labor. The patrol of the banks to prevent unauthorized deposits and the inspection of work done under department permits were continued. Four stream-gauging stations were maintained during the year. The amount expended during the fiscal year was \$42,991.99.

Condition at the end of fiscal year: All structures were in a good state of repair and the pools in satisfactory navigable condition. For controlling depths see report on Allegheny River, Pa., construction of locks and dams. The total amount expended to the end of the fiscal year was \$530,838.66.

Proposed operations: The locks and dams will be operated and maintained under allotments from the permanent indefinite appropriation provided by section 6 of the river and harbor act of March 3, 1909.

Commercial statistics: There is given below a comparative statement of that part of the traffic, in short tons, which passed the locks during the past three calendar years:

Lock.	1913		1914		1915	
	Up.	Down.	Up.	Down.	Up.	Down.
1.....	361,754	64,074	263,508	78,450	289,006	159,956
2.....	11,931	477,026	36,792	390,338	11,418	496,828
3.....	37,968	18,306	35,204	40,827	32,496	12,668

For the total tonnage and other details see "Allegheny River, Pa., open-channel improvement" and "Construction of locks and dams."

ALLEGHENY RIVER IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Kittanning, Pa., January 10, 1916.

Hon. S. TAYLOR NORTH, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Dispatches from Washington published in the Pittsburgh Sunday papers intimate your intention to introduce a bill in Congress for the improvement of the Allegheny River or seek to incorporate an appropriation therefor in the event of a rivers and harbors bill during this session.

As a matter of information, to guide you in so important and commendable a step, it would be well to understand that an appropriation has been made for the improvement of the Allegheny River in the Sixty-second Congress, which does not lapse with each succeeding Congress, but which is as useless at present as though it did lapse and required action de novo.

The attached letter of the Allegheny River Improvement Association, of which I am president, was sent out yesterday to all interests of the Allegheny Valley. The letter is self-explanatory, and will help you to a knowledge of the present situation concerning the river improvement.

The present varied and extensive industries of the Allegheny River Valley above the city of Pittsburgh and those interested in the development of its great natural resources feel that an injustice has been done by Congress in subordinating the improvement of the river to the interests of the city of Pittsburgh, assisted perhaps by some of the interests of the Monongahela and Youghiogheny Valleys who are adverse to the competition which the development of the Allegheny River would produce. The Pittsburgh bridge fight is something in the nature of a personal row of Capt. Rogers et al. against the Pennsylvania Railroad et al. that has been on for perhaps 20 years. In effect it is a plan to perpetuate a particular type of steamboat now in use on the Ohio River and ill adapted to low bridges, and also quite an unnecessary type of boat to successful navigation in the event of the improvement of the Allegheny River. The work of this association has been hampered—in fact, temporarily usurped—by the steamboat interests largely engaged in Ohio River traffic, and this is how we now happen to be in such distressing difficulties in getting the appropriation released, and is therefore the occasion for the hearing referred to in the attached letter.

You, with all other intelligent men, appreciate that the removal of obstructions to navigation is ordinarily made concurrent with the demand for such removal. Therefore to subordinate the improvement of the river to the removal of bridges in advance of the development of the facilities for slack-water navigation is an unwarranted, unreasonable procedure, having no purpose other than that of defeating the project and perpetuating a controversy in regard to the clearances of bridges in the Pittsburgh district, which partakes more of the nature of a subterfuge and personal animus than it does of good judgment or sound sense.

If the development of governmental facilities for transportation or those undertaken by a private or corporate enterprise attempted to remove obstructions prior to the necessity therefor, it would involve a waste of capital contrary to not only all precedent, but abortive of business acumen in every sense of the word.

When the necessity for the modification of the bridge clearances in the Pittsburgh district is made manifest by the presence of facilities on the Allegheny River for slack-water navigation and the assured tonnage that will follow such an improvement discloses the character and extent of the obstruction to navigation, then is sufficient time for the exercise of the prerogative of Government which seeks to conserve the public welfare, and order such modifications in the bridges as may seem proper and reasonable. The efforts of the interests of the Allegheny River Valley for the improvement of the river have been thwarted by restrictions attaching to the appropriation that can be regarded not only as subterfuges and sophistries but as being unreasonable in the basic principle upon which they were inserted into the act. If these restrictions can be removed from the present appropriation, then the people of this valley will feel encouragement that the Congress of the United States is in earnest in the same sense that we are in earnest in our endeavors for this improvement, otherwise we must continue our efforts in the hope that some time, somehow, we shall be favored with an enactment that will free us from the present legislative obstructions.

Presumably the hearing in Pittsburgh on the 25th of January is the logical course in the present status of affairs, but as the matter of raising the bridges is contended against by both the city of Pittsburgh and by corporate interests located therein, it is certain that the Secretary of War will get no assurances that the bridges will be raised, and the situation will remain statu quo indefinitely, for by the express wording of the act the appropriation is not to be released until he receives those assurances, and it is nothing short of simple folly to imagine that the parties contending against any modification of the bridges are going to give a favorable answer to the inquiry. I am therefore bound in the proper performance of my duty, supported unanimously by the association, that the Pittsburgh bridge controversy shall not overshadow and become the means of defeating the improvement of the river, for which latter purpose earnest and conscientious endeavor has been and will continue to be made.

I have devoted much time and consideration to this subject. It is a meritorious project. It will conserve a public need of great magnitude, and it ought to receive every consideration at the hands of Congress. I am at your service in trying to correct what now stands as an imposition on the valley interests and as a contemplated expense of over \$1,500,000 upon public and corporate investments in the city of Pittsburgh in advance of the time it is necessary that the expense should be incurred. What we should have is an appropriation made in the same manner that has governed all other appropriations for improved navigation where it conserved public welfare, and when in time it shall have been demonstrated that the bridges in Pittsburgh are obstructing the proper development of an improved watercourse the executive branch of Government is now clothed with sufficient authority to correct such an evil, if complained of.

Very truly, yours,

DWIGHT C. MORGAN,
President.

ALLEGHENY RIVER IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Kittanning, Pa., January 10, 1916.

Hon. S. TAYLOR NORTH, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the matter of the improvement of the Allegheny River, according to the plans and specifications of the Government engineers, approved by the rivers and harbors act of March 4, 1913, and making an initial appropriation of \$300,000 for the work, it was provided in the rivers and harbors act that no part of said amount shall be expended until the Secretary of War shall have received satisfactory assurance that the channel spans of the bridges forming unreasonable obstructions to navigation of the Allegheny River at Pittsburgh will be modified as recommended by a board of engineer officers in a report dated November 23, 1910.

It therefore having been made incumbent upon the Allegheny Valley interests desiring the improvement of the river to urge upon the Secretary of War the action contemplated and set forth by the act of Congress, a petition and brief was prepared by Mr. Albert Dettinger, attorney and counselor, Cincinnati, Ohio, reviewing the facts in connection with the bridges in the Pittsburgh district. An answer to this petition and brief was filed by certain interests in the city of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County adverse to disturbing such bridges as were regarded as unreasonable obstructions to navigation. A reply brief was in turn submitted by the petitioners, thereby placing before the Secretary of War all data and information concerning the matter of bridges, as affecting the release of the appropriation made by the Congress of the United States for the improvement of the river.

In compliance with instructions received from the Secretary of War by the Department of Government engineers at Pittsburgh, a hearing was called in the chamber of commerce in that city at 10 o'clock a. m., December 2, 1915, at which time Francis R. Shunk, lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers, explained the purpose of the meeting, and inasmuch as it was desired that all matters pertaining to the questions at issue should be presented in writing, the meeting was adjourned until Tuesday, January 25, 1916, at 10 o'clock, in room No. 311, post-office building, Pittsburgh, at which time the presentation of data and further discussion of the subject will be had.

Immediately following the meeting held in the chamber of commerce December 2, 1915, such interests as were represented by the Allegheny River Improvement Association outside of the city of Pittsburgh held a meeting in the Fort Pitt Hotel, and it was decided to report the situation to the interests of the Allegheny Valley, and to urge for presentation at the meeting to be held January 25 such written statements from all those interested in the improvement of the river as could be secured. These statements should include the resources, developed and undeveloped, of the valley, the amount and nature of the manufacturing industries, the probable products, in kind and amount, that would be likely to seek water transportation, if it were available, and the saving in freight costs that would follow. The improvement association authorized the president to appoint a committee of the association to carry out this work, and I have great pleasure in selecting you as a member of this committee, to do what you may be able to do personally and by enlisting the assistance of such others interested in the development of the valley as you may be able to reach through your personal acquaintance and influence.

The improvement of the Allegheny River is separate and apart from the bridge controversy, which has been unfortunately made a temporary barrier to its improvement, but it may be regarded with some degree of certainty that unless the interests of the valley disclose with proper assurances the importance and benefits to be derived from the improvement of the river, then just that long can it be expected that the bridge situation in the Pittsburgh district will become the paramount issue, and the development of the valley retarded for want of knowledge and appreciation of its developed and undeveloped resources that would be benefited by a system of slack-water navigation, as recommended by the Government engineers. It is therefore important that the real interests of the Allegheny Valley should not be overlooked in the issue now up for consideration, and it is earnestly hoped that you will give your assistance in order that we may achieve the purposes for which this organization was formed, and which it is believed can be concerted action be useful in accomplishing the improvement of the river. Will you not therefore give support to the matter in the form of a letter setting forth the facts desired, addressed to Francis R. Shunk, lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers, Pittsburgh, Pa., by January 25, 1916, the date set for the hearing, and if you can also be present on that occasion in behalf of the development of the Allegheny Valley it will strengthen the earnestness of our position and endeavor for the improvement of the river.

Very truly, yours,

DWIGHT C. MORGAN,
President.

JANUARY 15, 1916.

HON. DWIGHT C. MORGAN,
President Allegheny River Improvement Association,
Kittanning, Pa.

DEAR MR. MORGAN: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your valued favor of recent date relative to an appropriation for the improvement of the Allegheny River for slack-water navigation. As this improvement is principally the boundary on the west side of my congressional district I have given it considerable study. I have had the experience of running many rafts of timber down the Mahoning and Allegheny to the Pittsburgh markets and realize the great benefits to be derived by this improvement by the entire valley. In preparing this legislation I assure you that it will not contain any restrictions whatever.

I highly appreciate the kindly and helpful suggestions you have made in connection with this legislation and assure you that I stand ready to serve you and the Allegheny River Improvement Association when possible for me to do so.

I beg to remain, very truly, yours, S. TAYLOR NORTH.

THE PITTSBURGH & SHAWMUT RAILROAD CO.,
Kittanning Pa., January 17, 1916.

S. TAYLOR NORTH, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORTH: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favor of January 15, in reply to my letter concerning the improvement of the Allegheny River. I feel very sure that any activities on your part toward having the present restriction to the appropriation removed would be appreciated.

I also beg to acknowledge receipt of bill you have introduced for a post-office building in Kittanning. This is a very much needed improvement, and I trust your efforts in regard to both of the propositions, viz, the improvement of the river and a post-office building, will be urged by you to the fullest extent, and that we may realize on your efforts in those directions.

Very truly, yours, DWIGHT C. MORGAN,
Vice President.

A bill (H. R. 9234) appropriating money for the improvement of the Allegheny River, Pa., from Tarentum, Pa., to East Brady, Pa.

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$1,100,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, which sum shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, for the improvement of the Allegheny River, Pa., for slack-water navigation from Tarentum, Pa., to East Brady, Pa., according to plans prepared and recommended by the United States Government Engineers, and approved by the Secretary of War, in the report submitted in House Document No. 540, Sixty-second Congress, second session: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$1,388,000, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated.

HON. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

JUNE 22, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I would be pleased to have a copy of the hearings recently submitted to you by Col. Shunk relative to raising the bridges over the Allegheny River at Pittsburgh, Pa.

Thanking you in advance, I am,
Respectfully, S. TAYLOR NORTH.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, June 24, 1916.

HON. S. TAYLOR NORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: Your communication of June 22, 1916, in regard to furnishing you with a copy of Col. Shunk's report in the matter of the raising of the bridges over the Allegheny River at Pittsburgh, Pa., has been received.

In reply I beg to inform you that the report has been received in this office, but sufficient opportunity has not been had to thoroughly digest its contents and to examine into the voluminous records, exhibits, etc., which accompany it. The instructions of former Secretary of War (Mr. Garrison) in his memorandum of September 30, 1915, in regard to the matter are as follows:

"My conclusion, therefore, is to refer these cases in the usual course to the Chief of Engineers, with instructions to proceed in the usual way, giving full notice and opportunity to all parties in interest to produce every relevant fact. I shall, in addition to the usual instructions, insert a direction that, to the extent that they are able to do so, they shall in their report indicate the identity of facts which were before Secretary Root, so that I may be able to determine whether any new facts—and if so, what new facts—are in the new record.

"Upon the coming in of the report from the engineers I desire that notice be given to everybody in interest, accompanied by a copy of the report, the notice to be to the effect that upon a certain day fixed all parties who have any objection to the confirmation of the report and concurrence in its recommendations must file their objections in writing with me, stating each objection and the reason for it. If objections of the character just mentioned are filed, a day will then be set by me when I will sit and hear arguments of all the parties in interest."

It will be seen from the foregoing that the matter will require extensive consideration by the Chief of Engineers, and also that the procedure contemplates furnishing everybody in interest with a copy of the report at the proper time, with an opportunity to file a brief. Your request will be filed until that time, when it will receive further consideration.

Very respectfully,
W. M. BLACK,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army.
By C. KELLER,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, August 28, 1916.

HON. S. TAYLOR NORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: This is to inform you that the Secretary of War has postponed the hearing set for 10 a. m., August 31, 1916, concerning the bridges over the Allegheny River at Pittsburgh, about which complaints have been made, until 10 a. m., Wednesday, November 15, 1916.

All arguments and briefs in connection with this matter must be submitted on the date of the hearing.

Very respectfully,
W. M. BLACK,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, September 9, 1916.

From: The Chief of Engineers.
To: Hon. S. TAYLOR NORTH, House of Representatives.
Subject: Bridges over Allegheny River at Pittsburgh, Pa.

An error has been discovered in the report of the Chief of Engineers to the Secretary of War of August 8, 1916, concerning the bridges over the Allegheny River at Pittsburgh. In line 12, page 48, the last two figures should be 4.0 and 12.3 feet, instead of 11.0 and 19.3 feet. It is requested that the figures be corrected in the copy of report furnished you to avoid any future possible misunderstanding in this respect.

By direction of the Chief of Engineers,
Very respectfully,
C. KELLER,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, October 17, 1916.

From: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army.
To: Hon. S. TAYLOR NORTH, Representative in Congress, Punxsutawney, Pa.
Subject: Hearing concerning Allegheny River bridges.

This is to inform you that the Secretary of War has postponed the hearing set for 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, November 15, 1916, concerning the bridges over the Allegheny River at Pittsburgh, about which complaints have been made, until 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, December 6, 1916. All arguments and briefs in regard to the matter are to be submitted on that date.

Very respectfully,
W. M. BLACK,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army,
By C. KELLER,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers.

ENGINEER IN FAVOR OF CHANGE—COL. JADWIN SAYS RAISING BRIDGES WOULD BENEFIT CITY—INDUSTRIES ARE VITAL.

The point of view of the Pittsburghers and Pittsburgh interests which favor the raising of the Allegheny River bridges was yesterday given to the Dispatch by Col. Edgar Jadwin, Government engineer in charge of navigation in the Pittsburgh district. It is vigorously denied that the bridge-raising movement is a selfish propaganda, designed to aid other sections of the country at the expense of this city.

Col. Jadwin, in consenting to talk for publication, departs somewhat from the customary practice of Army men, but it is understood that he does so by permission of his superiors. This would indicate that the bridge-raising fight is now at a more critical stage than ever before and that certain very powerful interests are determined to "go through."

Col. Jadwin's attention was called to the fact that an organization of business men was being formed to oppose bridge raising, and he was asked to discuss the effect of the proposed raising upon the city's prosperity independent of its general effect upon navigation. After consulting with some of his associates he consented to do so and said:

"A number of your largest manufacturing companies urged us to have the bridges raised. These include the Carnegie Steel Co., Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., United States Aluminum Co., the Atlantic Refining Co., the Crucible Steel Co., and others. Two of these alone have put us on notice that they desire to increase their shipments on the Allegheny River within the next five years by an amount of over 1,600,000 tons. This class of freight is now saving on an average of 50 cents a ton on the Monongahela and Ohio Rivers in being hauled by water instead of by rail. At this rate the economic saving resulting from the new business of these companies alone will be in excess of \$800,000 per year.

MINES MUST BE WORKED.

"Think of this for a moment and bear in mind that few large and important cities exist save on a navigable body of water. Pittsburgh is situated at the confluence of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers, forming the Ohio. The rivers must remain. The mines must be worked here. The railroads entering Pittsburgh will doubtless remain so long as the traffic justifies. Should a withdrawal be conceivable, others would replace them, if needed for handling the tonnage. It is possible for the manufacturing establishments, in the absence of the best and most convenient facilities for transportation, to withdraw to other localities. The Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. has established a plant in Missouri, where it can not be deprived of a satisfactory navigation. The United States Aluminum Co., with a plant at New Kensington, on the Allegheny, has also similarly established a plant in Missouri. With the Allegheny River improved the glass company considers the location in the Allegheny Valley better for its purpose than any other part of the country. However, if relief is not afforded, they can eventually remove.

"The steel companies in prosperous times, when a mill becomes too old or is too uniformly deteriorated to modernize, build a new mill of the latest type in the best location. When business contracts they shut down the old mill and run the new, only using the old thereafter as a reserve. Should manufacturers generally remove from the Pittsburgh industrial region the railroads would follow the trade. As the matter now stands, all railroad traffic in the Pittsburgh region passes over more than a dozen railroad bridges at an elevation satisfactory to navigation interests, except the comparatively small quantity of freight carried over the lower elevation tracks of the Pennsylvania Railroad bridge at Eleventh Street. This, as well as the other, can

be satisfactorily carried at the upper elevation of tracks of that bridge, and at no unreasonable cost for the necessary changes. Also, the traffic passing over the highway bridges in question can well be carried at the elevation conforming to the heights of bridges recommended by Lieut. Col. Shunk.

TRANSPORTATION IMPORTANT.

"In other words, the future development and progress of Pittsburgh and the Allegheny Valley do not depend upon the effect of 8 to 12 feet difference in the elevation of the obstructive bridges crossing the Allegheny River on overhead traffic, but rather to holding its industrial supremacy, which depends primarily and ultimately upon its mills remaining. The mills should, therefore, be given the advantage of cheap water transportation for moving heavy bulk freight. With these assured, the growth of the city and valley can hardly be stopped. But deprived thereof by low-level bridges in perpetuity, they can not come into their own."

Acting in accordance with a resolution adopted at a meeting of representatives of many business interests with large financial investments in the downtown section of the city Monday afternoon to protest against the raising of the bridges over the Allegheny River, William McConway, temporary chairman of that meeting, yesterday selected the following men to form a permanent organization: Wilson S. Arbuthnot, of the Arbuthnot-Stephenson Co.; Herbert L. May, of the May Drug Co.; Alexander P. Moore, of the Pittsburgh Leader; A. H. Smith, of the Alling & Cory Paper Co.; and Harry S. Calvert, of the Enameled Products Co.

The purpose of the committee will be to perfect a plan and form a permanent organization to protest against the raising of the bridges over the Allegheny River. The business men held their first meeting in the assembly room of the Oliver Building Monday afternoon. This meeting was the first organized protest against the raising of the bridges, and upon organization the body will formally present its protest against the bridge raising to Secretary of War Newton D. Baker. The county commissioners yesterday had white marks placed on the Sixth Street Bridge at the height to which the floor of the bridge will have to be raised, if the change is ordered.

JANUARY 11, 1917.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I would be pleased to have you advise me what conclusion your department has come to in regard to raising the bridges over the Allegheny River at Pittsburgh, Pa. I am desirous of having an appropriation incorporated in the present rivers and harbors bill to continue the improvement of this river, in accordance with the engineers' estimates, provided the bridge controversy has been settled.

Thanking you for an early reply, I am,
Very respectfully, yours,

S. TAYLOR NORTH.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 13, 1917.

Hon. S. TAYLOR NORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 11th instant I beg to inform you that no conclusion has as yet been reached in regard to the raising of the bridges over the Allegheny River at Pittsburgh. The counsel in the case were given until January 1 to file supplemental briefs, at which time I expected to commence my examination of the record with a view to deciding the controversy as quickly as possible. It appears that some delay has been encountered by counsel in getting their briefs printed and filed, but I expect to take the matter up for consideration shortly. I can not say at this time just how long it may take before a decision can be rendered, but I expect to expedite it as much as possible consistent with a thorough understanding of the situation and full consideration of the matters involved.

Very respectfully,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

JANUARY 10, 1917.

Hon. S. M. SPARKMAN,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: In view of anticipated favorable action by the Secretary of War relative to raising the bridges over the Allegheny River at Pittsburgh, Pa., thereby releasing an appropriation of \$300,000 heretofore made for the improvement of this river, I request your committee's favorable consideration of a bill I introduced on January 17, 1916, appropriating \$1,100,000 for the improvement of this river according to plans prepared and recommended by the United States Government engineers, and approved by a former Secretary of War.

Assuring you of my deep interest in this matter, I am,
Sincerely, yours,

S. TAYLOR NORTH.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1917.

Hon. S. TAYLOR NORTH,
House of Representatives of the United States.

MY DEAR MR. NORTH: I have yours of the 10th, and note your desire that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors should consider favorably your bill, introduced on January 17, 1916, appropriating \$1,100,000 for the improvement of the Allegheny River. Replying I beg to say that the committee will be glad to take this up at any time when we have finished the present bill and shall have gotten it out of the way. Until then it would hardly be practicable for us to consider it unless we were to take it up before action by the War Department has been had on the proposition to raise the bridges over that river at Pittsburgh, which the committee does not desire to do. I note, however, in your letter that favorable action upon that request is anticipated, and as soon as the decision of the Secretary of War in the matter is rendered the committee will be glad to give consideration to your bill, provided, of course, the decision of the Secretary of War is favorable, as you think it will be.

I regard that as a very important project once the obstructions above mentioned are removed.

With assurances of regard, I am,

Yours, very truly,

S. M. SPARKMAN, Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance from Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, to the sea,

\$1,870,000; for maintenance of improvement from Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, to Lalor Street, Trenton, \$40,000; completing improvement above Lalor Street, Trenton, \$90,000; and for completing improvement at Camden, N. J., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1120, Sixty-third Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$71,080; in all, \$2,071,080.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Some of the matters inserted here are wasteful, but that is a matter of individual judgment, as has been suggested. I have not mentioned all of those that seem to warrant that appellation. I do not believe the Delaware River project is wasteful. I believe it is a necessary project. Of course, we all agree that Congress should see that the navigation of the country is carried out and that commerce is properly cared for. I think, however, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] should be equally generous, and when I move to strike out \$800,000 on the upper Mississippi project, in all fairness he should move to strike out \$870,000 from the Delaware River project, because, although there is great commerce there—while there is very little in the upper Mississippi—still, due to the condition of the Treasury, I think that would be a commendable sacrifice upon his part that would be greatly appreciated. I am not going to urge it, but I do say this, that \$450,000 of the money used last year on that river was for a dredging company over in Baltimore—the Maryland Dredging Co.—which received 14.7 cents per square yard for work there and 24.9 cents on another contract, while other companies that had contracts there received approximately only 9 cents for dredging. I do not ask these questions for the purpose of puzzling anyone, and I do not suppose the chairman can tell why one company, the Baltimore company, which seems to have had practically an exclusive contract on many of the projects in this part of the country, should charge over twice as much as the other company working on the same project. I do not suppose the gentleman from Philadelphia knows, either.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I can say this to the gentleman: The report shows that there was a controversy over one of these contracts, and it is set forth in the report of the engineer in charge of the Philadelphia district. The contractor failed to do his work and litigation has ensued. I think the matter is now in the Court of Claims. It is one of those things that might happen on any river. Apparently it was because the contractor bit off more than he could chew.

Mr. FREAR. Well, that is the amount, as I said before, this Baltimore concern is getting, over double what the other is getting. It seems to me it is an unreasonable amount, but I am not going to move to strike it out. There was \$325,000 of Government dredging on that; \$1,045,000, or three times the amount approximately, was for contract dredging. Office engineer's expenses were \$225,000 on this one contract last year. On hand they had \$2,234,000 and this bill carries \$2,020,000 more. On the Delaware River below there was \$5,690 used last year and \$1,768, or one-third, was for office expenses. The Delaware River at Trenton there is \$90,000 asked for now. Office expenses last year were \$5,637. Let me suggest this, Mr. Chairman, on that project the Government is engaged in at Trenton, at the rate of \$21.50 per square yard, it is right up in front of the village of Trenton. I am not going to move to strike out these items, because I realize the Delaware River is an important project, but it would seem to me that there is no necessity here pressing these very large appropriations at this time for a case like that where there is no commerce at all; that is, on the last project; there is none at Trenton. However, that is all I care to say.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman made a motion?

Mr. FREAR. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not think it necessary to take up the time of the committee to discuss this matter of the Delaware River. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has conceded it is a great river, and I think if I had the time I could convince the committee that it is the greatest commercial river in the United States. Of course, it costs something to maintain it and it costs something for office expenses. I assume that is due to the fact that a number of men are employed in a big way and that conditions which would apply at Goose Creek would not apply to the Delaware River. Hence there must be a proportionate increase in expenses. I hope that will answer the gentleman from Wisconsin as to that.

Now, when it comes to that spirit of comity that ought to exist between the gentleman from Wisconsin and myself, with respect to my following him when he moved to strike out an item on the Mississippi, and his following me, should I move to strike out an item for the Delaware, I have to say this,

that I have come to understand that the Members of this House have rights on this floor, and that every man comes here from a constituency that charges him with representing it the best he can. I defend the Delaware River to the best of my ability. I ask for it, and so do my colleagues from Pennsylvania, that which we think it deserves. I do not feel that I have the right to invade the district of the gentleman from Wisconsin or to set up claims for a river there or to set up opposition to it after it has been approved by the committee and the engineers. I believe I ought to concede something to the integrity of the gentleman from Wisconsin as a representative of the people who send him here. I believe in the matter of Mud Creek, in Kentucky, or Goose Creek, in Wisconsin, or elsewhere, that if its claims are fairly presented to the committee and the committee, acting upon the report of the United States Army Engineers, brings in a favorable report that I am in a manner estopped from interfering with the prerogatives and preserves of my colleague, unless it is clear that the transaction is unwarranted. Under ordinary circumstances I should not deny him that right of representing his people, which I ask and demand as a right for my own. [Applause.] Now, the gentleman has indicated that there is no business on the upper Delaware at Trenton. That particular portion of the project is carrying a 12-foot depth through rock, from Lalor Street to the wharves in Trenton. There is no large traffic there because the work of improvement is unfinished. But on the upper Delaware to Lalor Street steamships are coming back and forth from Philadelphia to 1 or 2 miles below the city of Trenton, at a reduced cost of transportation and to the great relief of merchants and railroads as well. The Government has not completed the 12-foot depth to the city itself. That is what the people are waiting for. The channel has been carried only to within a mile or two of the city, and in front of the city the engineers have encountered rock, and, of course, there is no commerce there where blasting has been going on.

When the way is clear, then the vessels will go on to Trenton; then they will come from Trenton; then the business will be done. The very purpose of the improvement, the very reason for the expenditure, is to provide the way for commerce, to blaze the way through the rock, as it were, in order that the greater number of people may be served.

Why, we have been carrying commerce to the mouth of the Raritan Canal on the upper Delaware, and we have been using that old waterway to New York. The congestion upon the railroads and the heavy freight rates did it. The inability to make speedy shipments because the rail companies have not the cars to carry the freight. This is why such improvements are needed. They will afford the people at least a measure of relief. The gentleman from Wisconsin would not stop the course of progress, even though he is endeavoring to uphold the banner of economy in this House. And I trust, though he has made no amendment, this paragraph will stand just as it has been written.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understood the gentleman was not going to make a motion to strike out \$800,000?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Strike out \$800,000 of the item for the Delaware River? Of course not. I have been pleading with the gentleman from Wisconsin, and he realizes the plea is just; I have been pleading with others to hasten appropriations for the Delaware, so that this great work can be finished and these eternal delays involving great waste shall cease. Finish up the job, and we will secure real economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of the Delaware River.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, an objector to practically every item in an omnibus bill serves a very good purpose indeed, for he calls to the attention of the country the character of the items carried in the measure, and I am sure the individual sponsors for these items welcome the opportunity of rising in their places to defend them.

It is quite an easy matter to stand off and criticize this rivers and harbors bill, and it has grown to be the fashion to do so, to dub it the "pork barrel," and to seek to bring discredit upon Members introducing the bills and upon the splendid committee who thrash them out, assemble them, and bring them into this House.

Now, there is never a single item reported that is not fully explained by the various experts who have investigated it, and these explanations are set forth in printed reports, accessible to all Members who desire information concerning them. One might almost believe, from the charges brought by critics of

this measure, who spring up from time to time and flourish temporarily in the limelight, that all a Member of Congress has to do is to whisper to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that he desires an appropriation for a river or rivers in his district, and, presto, out rolls the money. As a matter of fact, there is no legislation so well safeguarded as that for river and harbor improvement. First and foremost, a petition for this assistance must come from responsible people of a location, and they must show conclusively the soundness of their claim for Federal help; their claim and prayers must be presented to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors by the Member introducing the bill, and, provided the necessities of a sufficiently large number of residents seem to warrant an investigation, the committee reports favorably a preliminary survey. The Congress then authorizes and directs the War Department to make the survey, and engineers and experts of the Government proceed with that work. Upon their report, which is submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War, it is decided whether or not an appropriation will be considered for the project. If such report is favorable, a second bill must be introduced proposing that the appropriation be made. Again the whole matter is thrown upon the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and they consider and weigh the report or reports of the various War Department officials and submit their report to the House. Now, these Army officers have no connection with the Congress—they are not political appointees—and it is inconceivable that they, together with the people asking for the project, the Member who introduces the bill, and the gentlemen of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, are all in collusion and keep the facts out of sight and state conditions which do not exist, for the purpose of wringing money from the Treasury for an unworthy object.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here and support an appropriation for the deepening of the Delaware River in front of the city of Camden, and I invite all who are skeptical, or critical, or enterprising to go up there and look from shore to shore of the Delaware River at that point. The skeptical and critical will be convinced of the absolute worthiness of the project, and the enterprising will be mightily tempted to drive stakes there and seek to improve their opportunities along with the developments that are bound to come to Camden as a great port of this country. She is now a city with a population of nearly 103,000. Her manufacturing establishments number about 350, in which are made almost everything wearable, edible, useful, and luxurious. Nobody asks where Camden is located. Everybody knows, for her fame is abroad. "His Master's Voice" has carried far. The little steel pen found on the desk of almost every business man, in countinghouses, on boudoir desks, and in schools and colleges, proclaims its birthplace. Campbell's soups—"six plates for 10 cents"—the food that has not "gone up," is familiar refreshment all over the civilized world. Many of the greatest battleships of our Navy slid down "the ways" from the New York Shipbuilding Plant in Camden while being christened. Yes; the enterprise and business activities centered in that city on the Delaware have advertised her broadly.

Camden has a water-borne traffic of three and a quarter million tons of freight, valued at nearly \$26,000,000, and this traffic will be wonderfully increased when we have a sufficient depth of water to permit deeper draft vessels to land at our wharves. The water front of Philadelphia, just opposite, is almost beyond expansion, and Camden is bound to become to that great metropolis what Jersey City and Brooklyn are to the city of New York. We have a frontage on the Delaware River of 6 miles, plentifully strewn with large business establishments, dealing in lumber, cork, licorice, chalk, soap, metal polish, whiting, Paris green, ranges and heaters, and talking-machine works, and numerous ship building and repair yards. Flowing through the center of the city, in confluence with the Delaware, is the Cooper River, navigable 9 miles, and likewise dotted with numerous and thriving manufacturing establishments.

The industries of Camden, which are widely diversified, include the most important of the country, some of them the largest of their kind. There are machine shops, large foundries, woolen and worsted mills, leather manufactories, shoe factories, chemical works, candy factories, cigar factories, paint and varnish laboratories, and in fact almost every article known to productive industry has its representative establishment in this wide-awake and enterprising city.

Until 1885 the natural channel of the Delaware River was on the Camden side, but in carrying out the Government project for the improvement of the Philadelphia Harbor a dike was built from Fishers Point, on the Jersey shore, to the eastern point of Pettys Island, a distance of 3,500 feet. This dike, with an opening of only 300 feet, was built notwithstanding

the protests of Camden interests, and those of the governor of New Jersey, the State legislature, and the riparian commission. The result of the diversion of the water from its natural channel has been shoaling all along the Camden water front, and the relief by the Government of this condition is not only logical but is really only an act of justice long deferred. The necessities for deeper water are great and pressing.

The city, realizing the importance of developing its commerce, has secured the passage of State laws under which the development of its water front may be carried out; bonds may be issued for the acquisition of water-front property and for the building of docks and other harbor facilities. Pettys Island, a part of New Jersey, situated at the upper end of the Philadelphia Harbor, and partly bordering on the upper portion of the proposed 18-foot channel, has recently been purchased by two very large concerns—the Crew-Levick Co. and the Wm. Cramp & Sons Ship and Engine Building Co. Extensive plans for its development have been made, which will involve an outlay of several million dollars. The island will be connected with the main New Jersey shore by a railroad bridge, and thus directly link rail and water transportation at this point. The Crew-Levick Co. has announced that they propose to use this property as their principal export station in this country, and as the company is one of the largest engaged in refining and shipping oil and petroleum products, it means the building up of a large export-trade center. Warehouses, wharves, and docks will be built, and as the channel on the Pennsylvania side of the island is none too wide, it is reasonably certain that these piers will have to be erected on the side facing the New Jersey channel. Vessels going to and from these docks will want to use the east side of the river, and the channel provided for will come none too soon.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and believe that this item will meet with the approval of every Member of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wilmington Harbor, Del.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to make a statement.

If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is right, I must be wrong; and if so, I want to know it at this time. He says that whenever a Member of Congress comes before this House and presents an item here for his river or for his creek—and the other day he said, "or for his post office"—when a Member of Congress comes here and makes that request, in honor bound, every other Member is obliged to accept his statement and refuse to oppose it. That is the only logical conclusion. I wonder if that is the right course for us to pursue? We are not here, as I understand, representing Philadelphia or Pennsylvania or Wisconsin any more than we are representing the Government Treasury. If I believe that a project is wrong, whether it is a post-office building or whether it is a river and harbor project, or whether it is a private claim that some one is trying to get through, I think it is a duty we owe ourselves and owe to the country to try to expose it and stop it if need be. I know gentlemen on this floor who tell me the pressure is hard and has been hard for individual projects from their home communities.

Well, now, I do not believe in every case that those gentlemen are to be criticized, but I can not understand why I should be criticized and in honor bound compelled to remain silent. According to that standard I have no right to enter a protest here. And yet I know that on the upper Mississippi River the money is wasted. There are other Members who know that river. I made a motion in the committee to cut the appropriation down. But, Mr. Chairman, if that is a right standard I have no business to oppose any of these bills. The gentlemen in the Senate who came within one vote of defeating the bill last time ought to remain mute—with their mouths closed. What right have they if some Member of Congress asks for his project that calls for so much money from the Treasury?

Each one of us has to represent the Government. I do not criticize because our standards may be different from theirs, but unless I can have some further proof that my course is wrong in calling attention to what is unnecessary at this particular time and to this condition of the Treasury I shall continue as best I can to disclose the facts, although I will do so courteously, and I do not want to be put in the attitude of impugning unfair motives to my colleagues. They may defend the projects if they choose, and I have the right to point wasteful projects out as I see them.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly surprised at the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] in attempting to curtail the activities of the distinguished public servant from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], who has assumed the responsible duty

of regulating and controlling the activities of legislation here, of preventing steals from the Treasury, and preventing the Army engineers of the United States from extravagance and wastefulness and fraud.

And in connection with the engineers, I would like to call attention to what the gentleman said a while ago in speaking of the Delaware River. He referred to dredging contracts and collusion between dredging companies. In his report, the minority report, from which I read, occurs this language:

Specific evidence also has been placed in the RECORD, and resolutions of investigation introduced, concerning dredging companies and their activities with waterway lobbies and secret methods of allotting Government contracts. These resolutions affecting any secret activities of railways, dredging companies, or other interests in connection with waterway bills before Congress are of public importance and should be pressed for consideration by those in either House possessing sufficient influence to ascertain the facts.

And then occurs this language:

Evidence of apparent extravagance or fraud in the present method of letting contracts is offered in this connection.

Now, if that language carries with it any inference whatever, it is that the engineers are guilty of extravagance or fraud or violation of the law in letting contracts for river and harbor work. If that is the only inference that can be drawn from it, I submit that the gentleman from Wisconsin is uttering a statement which he ought to make only with great deliberation when he charges the Army engineers with fraud, with violations of the law, with premeditated and knowing extravagance. But that is the only inference from his language.

Innuendo ought not to be indulged in when gentlemen are maligning the character and reputation and good name of others. If the gentleman intends all that language implies—and I submit it is the only inference that can be drawn from it—then he ought to say so. If he does not intend it, then he ought to retract it.

The Chief of Engineers and the Army engineers need no defense at my hands or at the hands of any Member of this House. Their learning, their skill, their record in the public service, to which in all that record there has been only one charge of fraud or misuse of public money, place them beyond the need of defense. In that case, occurring at Savannah, Ga., there were no more persistent and energetic prosecutors of the officer charged with and proven to have been guilty of fraud than his colleagues, the Army engineers. With that exception, I reiterate the statement that for character and integrity and for efficiency in the public service they stand unchallenged before the American people. The gentleman ought not to impugn their character by innuendo, but, if he means to do so, he ought to do so openly, by language about which there can be no misconception or ambiguity. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appoquinimink, Murderkill, and Mispillion Rivers, Del.: For maintenance, \$20,000; for improvement of Mispillion River, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 678, Sixty-second Congress, second session, except that part of said improvement known as Cut-off No. 2, which is hereby eliminated from said project, \$35,200: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any lands required for the purpose of this improvement; in all, \$55,200.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FREAR. I will agree to a part of what the gentleman [Mr. SMALL] says who has just spoken. However, he rises in defense of the present method of letting contracts. I will submit to anyone that that statement, in view of the facts that were presented in the report and on which I will present further facts in the RECORD, warrants inspection and possibly criticism, not of the Army Engineers necessarily, but of the methods of making contracts, when one company, at an average rate of 26½ cents on its contracts, is enabled to control dredging for a whole district. When I asked the engineer in committee how it came about, he did not know. It looks as if there was a dearth of contractors or of bidders, not that the officers, the Army engineers, are dishonest, or are committing fraud. That is not the suggestion. One company controls many contracts. Down on the James River it has the whole contract, and it has contracts in other places, including a \$450,000 contract in the Delaware. Facts concerning such contracts at excessive dredging rates were put into the RECORD before and will be again. In fact, there existed, and probably still exists to-day, an association of dredgers, with an understanding between them to let contracts and fix prices. It is significant, to say the least, and attention should be called to this condition of affairs. That the agreement

still exists may be borne out by the fact that only one contractor appears to have been considered in regard to these cases, and all such contracts at a high rate compared with others. That is not a charge against the engineers. They are helpless, as I understand, and they have to take what is offered. There ought to be fair competition. It falls right back on Congress to refuse to make appropriations for private contracts unless genuine competition exists.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. COX. As I recall, last year a provision was placed on the river and harbor bill prohibiting contracts to be let to private parties for dredging at a profit in excess of 25 per cent.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. COX. Did that finally become a law?

Mr. FREAR. That finally became a law.

Mr. COX. How did it work? Was it workable?

Mr. FREAR. No one can tell. That was put in the law because of the project in which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] is interested more particularly. As the Army engineer well said, unless you have a Government dredge working by the side of a private dredge, you can not tell the comparative cost. Where the private dredge alone is engaged in doing the excavating, you have no way of determining what the cost of doing the work by the Government should be.

Mr. COX. What is the name of this large dredging concern?

Mr. FREAR. The Maryland Dredging & Contracting Co.

Mr. COX. A corporation?

Mr. FREAR. I assume so. By the way, the head of that company is the same as that in the dredger's statement who allotted contracts for the dredging association, and thereby fixed the price. That notice or agreement was put in the RECORD.

Mr. COX. What is his name?

Mr. FREAR. The name appears in the RECORD as Frank Fuerst. I do not know the gentleman.

Mr. COX. The gentleman says he allotted these dredging contracts?

Mr. FREAR. That was the statement which was put into the RECORD, and I will put it into the RECORD again; the letter in which Fuerst asked members of the dredging association to see to it that Members of Congress were fed at banquets, because it made them good-natured. That was substantially the statement. He further said this matter of allotting contracts had made them a great deal of trouble.

Mr. COX. What Members attended the banquet?

Mr. FREAR. I think I had better read it. I can not state it as well as I can read it.

Mr. COX. That is news to me.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is a very serious matter. Going to a banquet is a frightful business!

Mr. COX. I do not know whether it is or not. That is news to me.

Mr. FREAR. I thought this might come up, so I brought it along and am indebted to the gentleman from North Carolina for reminding me of these contracts.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It came up after the banquet.

Mr. FREAR. I am reading the notice sent out by Mr. Fuerst, who is president of the association, who signs the statement. This was sent to me through New York parties, and it has never been questioned or criticized. I have put it in the RECORD twice already.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will my friend from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. FREAR. If I can get a little more time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not object to these dredging men having a dinner once in a while, does he?

Mr. FREAR. No; many of them, if necessary.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They work hard all day, and they have to go to dinner sometimes.

Mr. FREAR. Let me read further.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was any Member of Congress named as having attended these banquets?

Mr. FREAR. No. They are mentioned generally.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then all Members present are absolved?

Mr. FREAR. We are all included. This is the statement about the allotting of contracts.

Mr. COX. Was that originally published in a newspaper, or how did the gentleman get it?

Mr. FREAR. No; it was sent to me by gentlemen from New York.

Mr. COX. Did it come through the mail?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; that particular one did, but I have since had the source explained and feel confident it is absolutely reliable.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know how many concerns in the United States have heretofore been engaged in the operation of dredging?

Mr. FREAR. No. This is on the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. COX. How many are engaged there?

Mr. FREAR. I would not be able to state. There are several in Philadelphia and others both north and south; many concerns, I assume, from Boston down to Florida.

Mr. COX. Are they all members of this one association?

Mr. FREAR. I can not speak for a certainty as to that. The gentleman will find when he examines what I put in the RECORD the dredgers and other people who have contributed to the river and harbor congress, and their names will show and the assumption can be made whether they are members of the dredging association. I can not say as to that. We can find upon the investigation provided for in a resolution which I offer again to-day, by calling these people before us whether they are allotting contracts to-day.

Mr. COX. If I understand the gentleman aright, there are several concerns engaged in dredging, and the attempt has been made to get them all together and combine.

Mr. FREAR. I assume so.

Mr. COX. For the purpose of allotting contracts, each getting his share, and serious complaint has been made that the banquets have not been well attended.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I want to say that I never received an invitation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know whether there are enough private dredges in the United States to do work that the Government desires done?

Mr. FREAR. I am afraid not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it possible that a combination of all the dredges when there are not sufficient dredges that they could in any way seriously interfere with Government work?

Mr. FREAR. The obvious answer is that under present conditions the cost will be far in excess of reasonable remuneration, because they can get all the work they want under present conditions without limit to price, and they assume control of the entire district. This one combination charges on many projects 26½ cents, whereas on a single project in the same district one other concern charges 9 cents.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Perhaps one has to go through rock and the other through sand.

Mr. FREAR. No; I want to correct the gentleman on that, because the report says that it is mud and sand in all these Baltimore district projects mentioned.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I assume that there would be an entirely different charge in dredging sand in the St. John and rock in the Hudson River. Now, I assume that if there were no dredges or drills in the vicinity of the Hudson River—private concerns in which I have no interest whatever, that would unquestionably do the work in the Hudson River—it would be necessary for the engineers to ask people of some other sections of the country for prices to do that work. As a matter of fact, the Government has had to build some dredges to do certain work, because there were no private dredges.

Mr. FREAR. This dredging at 26½ cents per yard is for mud and sand.

I submit herewith a statement, as promised, and from which I have read, which shows other matters of vital interest concerning river and harbor legislation and contracts that require investigating.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection I desire to offer testimony tending to show—

First. That whatever may be the judgment of the Federal Congress, a powerful waterway lobby, whose president is a leading legislator, insists in its official report that waterway appropriations throughout the country are allotted geographically, due to the power of such lobby over Congress.

Second. That in the letting of contracts for Government dredging throughout the country an organization of dredgers insists it has allotted private dredging contracts among dredgers, and necessarily, through lack of competition, has held up the Government for excessive charges to meet its demands.

Third. That this dredgers' organization, which includes dredgers along the eastern seaboard, in past years has been a strong contributor to the support of the same waterway lobby that claimed to control the making up of waterway bills.

Fourth. That the head of the dredgers' association annually receives Government contracts aggregating upward of a million

dollars, and at prices that indicate no genuine competition to-day exists among dredgers.

Fifth. That the Board of Engineers, under present methods, through its recommendations to Congress practically determines the necessities of different waterways where public money is to be expended on old projects and Congress determines what new projects are to be adopted.

Sixth. That if the lobby determines the geographical allotment of waterway appropriations throughout the country, it must exercise some potent influence in the distribution of appropriations for old projects and over Congress itself in the allotment of new contracts.

Believing that these claims are so serious in character that they merit immediate consideration, I offer first evidence submitted in its official report wherein the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, a waterway lobby, claims to control the allotment of Government appropriations geographically in proportion to contributions received by that lobby.

PROJECTS DISTRIBUTED ACCORDING TO CONTRIBUTIONS.

By paying 1 per cent of Federal appropriations to the support of the River and Harbors Congress every community can feel it has the supporting arm of this second congress. On pages 60 to 62 of the 1911 report appears a list of appropriations given to the different States of the Union amounting, in all, to \$178,616,897 from 1907 to 1911, inclusive.

In two columns the members of the "second congress" are impressed with the relation between that body and the amount of Government appropriations for each separate State. I quote literally from the listed method of comparison and cite a dozen States or more to show the proportionate grabs that are held out invitingly to gaze by the Rivers and Harbors Congress officials.

	Amounts subscribed to the support of National Rivers and Harbors Congress, by States, 1906-1911, inclusive.	Amount of appropriations received by States, in rivers and harbors bill, 1907-1911, inclusive.
Pennsylvania (east).....	\$4,295	\$4,837,745
Connecticut.....	2,115	2,318,090
Massachusetts.....	2,850	1,451,733
Maryland.....	1,765	2,778,265
New Jersey.....	2,735	3,484,895
North Carolina.....	2,538	2,259,614
South Carolina.....	1,137	1,237,290
Virginia.....	4,306	4,082,454
Georgia.....	8,281	4,102,889
Florida.....	1,620	5,188,670
District of Columbia.....	1,530	1,243,000
Alabama.....	6,090	6,952,000
Louisiana.....	9,505	3,820,292
Texas.....	8,825	9,196,309
Mississippi River.....		21,842,775

Mississippi River (1914), \$10,500,000, or nearly one-half of the six years' total.

DISTRIBUTING THE PORK.

New York and Florida receive more than the average State, excepting that the Mississippi River lump sum would swell the adjacent States over \$21,000,000, if counted.

Doubtless it appeals to lay members to realize that by the investment of \$1 in the "second congress" \$100 will be forthcoming from the Federal Congress. It is in harmony with the views of Secretary Ellison and of the purposes set forth so eloquently by the constitution.

To become entitled to generous Federal appropriations as a harvest for a 1 per cent investment, the following rates for annual dues are provided for membership in the "National Rivers and Harbors Congress of the United States," as it is styled by its officers:

	Annual dues.
Individuals.....	\$5
Firms or corporations.....	10
Organizations of less than 400.....	25
Organizations over 400 and less than 600.....	50
Organizations of 600 to 1,000.....	75
Organizations of 1,000 or more.....	100
Waterway associations.....	100

In addition to its claim of controlling appropriations according to local contributions to the lobby, I give a further testimonial as to its aims and standards.

SECRETARY ELLISON'S LEGISLATIVE STANDARDS.

A speech by an officer of this second congress, delivered on the same occasion, is of special interest. Capt. Ellison, a former secretary and treasurer of the Rivers and Harbors Con-

gress, has given the Members of the Federal Congress a new freedom of action, governed only by ability to get each one's share of loot. It is a novel amendment to the oath of office to which Congressmen subscribe. Mr. Ellison said in his annual speech:

I want to repeat and to emphasize that in supporting the National Rivers and Harbors Congress you are supporting your own cause. * * * Mark you, it is not my intention to criticize either Congress or Congressmen for lack of business methods, for I truly believe the average man who comes to Washington is just as good a business man as the average man he has left at home. It is not his fault, as I see it, but our fault, and I use the word "our" in a nation-wide sense. We send him here to legislate for the Nation theoretically, but actually to get all he can for us; and if he does not get our share, and then some, we do our best to replace him with some other man, who will take better care of our particular congressional district.

That report from which I have cited is not sent broadcast by an irresponsible lobby. That lobby maintains quarters in this city throughout the year. About a month ago it gathered together hundreds of waterway enthusiasts from all over the country with its shibboleth, "a \$50,000,000 annual governmental appropriation for a policy, not a project." At that meeting it was addressed by the Vice President of this country, who recommended that the present system of omnibus-bill legislation be stopped. At that meeting it was addressed by the present Chief of Engineers, who determines locality of waterway improvements and amounts needed. At that meeting it was addressed by an ex-Chief of Engineers, who stated that waterway appropriations never exceeded one-half of 1 per cent pork. From the foregoing it will be observed that this lobby is, or believes itself to be, all powerful, and that it is directly and openly supported and directed by leading legislators and administrative officers of this present administration.

HOW THE DREDGERS ALLOT CONTRACTS.

I submit a statement secretly issued by a dredgers' organization and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in a speech made September 29, 1914. It shows the methods and power exercised by that organization over Government dredging contracts aggregating many millions of dollars annually.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ATLANTIC AND GULF COAST DREDGE OWNERS' ASSOCIATION, MARCH 13, 1901.

To the Atlantic and Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association.

GENTLEMEN: In accordance with the constitution, rules, and by-laws of this association, your board of directors, through your president, present for your consideration herewith their report for the year ending February 13, 1901, adding thereto such recommendations and suggestions as your board have considered during the past year.

The year just closing, the eighteenth year of the association, and the years since its organization have been marked by constant and faithful effort to promote, through the means of general work and enterprise, everything that will make for the good of every operator enrolled in its membership. Measures have been constantly brought to your attention and every effort made to uplift our business and protect it in all proper and legitimate channels.

These efforts have been more or less successful, but always along the line of an earnest endeavor to conserve the real interests of our business.

During the past year your board have especially taken up for consideration the question of its department for fixing prices on work and the allotment of work through the commissioners of that department and have carefully studied the problems which present themselves in connection with that line of work.

The department in question was not originally contemplated by the founders of this association, nor was it intended as any part of the work for which the association was formed.

The organization had its origin in the recognized desire of many operators in the dredging business for effective cooperation in many important fields of work, where the general interests of their business had long been neglected. It was felt by the progressive men who had invested large amounts of capital in this business that an organization of operators could be effected by the Atlantic coast whose duty and object would be the closer affiliation of operators and the combination of the talent and energy in the business for the promotion by all lawful means for the advancement of their business, and to present a united front, supported by united resources, to meet and overcome any and all obstacles then existing or thereafter appearing.

IN UNION THERE IS STRENGTH.

It was the old and tried principle, to wit, "In union there is strength" and "A house divided against itself falls," and the keynote of all successful organizations must be that very same principle. Following this rule, the effort of this association should have been confined entirely to meeting and overcoming obstacles which come from without—fighting the common enemy, so to speak. This would mean the promotion of all measures for urging public bodies to undertake public improvements in submarine work, compelling the enactment of reasonable laws governing our work, and the repeal of obnoxious and vexatious laws; experiments in all branches of machinery and devices used in our business, and a general department for furnishing to each member information desired by him regarding any particular work, or concerning which other members may have knowledge, giving in every way to each member the fullest possible data regarding dredging operations on the coast and the history of each piece of work.

So many measures of general interest and value are included in the work that could be successfully performed by an association to the advantage of its members, and so much can be done in the way of promoting good fellowship amongst them by means of this organization, and also by entertaining prominent and influential men at its banquets and through special committees, that enumeration here of all these different and important measures is unnecessary.

Any thoughtful man who is engaged in our business can readily see how important it is that an efficient organization of operators should be maintained to promote measures of general interest and value.

QUARRELING OVER SPOILS.

Some years after the organization was effected an element entered into its work which has almost crowded out all features of general work and has practically turned the association, which was originally formed for general benefits only, into a special organization for the distribution of work and apportionment of contracts. Starting, as it did, in the desire to combine against outsiders, it has ended in combining against itself; and instead of its members standing together to promote the business of dredging in all its general and important details, as above mentioned, we behold a spectacle of members quarrelling one with another over the division of work, and each one complaining that the association is a failure because it does not give to each one all the work that he feels is his due, each member forgetting that the association simply undertook this duty because it was forced upon it, and because other agencies to do that work had failed, and because the operators on the Atlantic coast refused to enter into proper arrangements for dividing work amongst them and preferred to load this work upon the association, a work for which the latter was unfitted, for which it was never intended or formed, and the only excuse for foisting this measure upon it was apparently the dredging operators failed to appreciate that this kind of work was done in other lines of business by special pools organized for no other purpose and specially organized for that purpose alone.

It is time that all thoughtful men in this association pause and consider whether the association is to blame for failing to perform a task entirely beyond its powers or resources, and also whether it would be well for the association to reject this burden and relegate it to proper agencies and take up the duties for which it was organized.

We think it is time that this bone of contention removed from the midst of our association and the members once more united and working along the lines of common interest. Little of the real value of this association has been demonstrated or developed of recent years and much disagreement and bitterness has come between the members in that time, and all because the association has neglected its real duties and buried itself with false ones. The former would bind its members more firmly together, whereas the latter simply disintegrates our ranks.

It is certainly time that this "Jonah" be thrown overboard and left to the tender mercies of some sufficient "whale" or "pool" and the association be permitted to again bend to its task and resume its long interrupted voyage.

In presenting these views to the members your board feel that they are simply pointing out the pitfall into which this association has become entangled, and which has retarded its growth and usefulness for some years and has brought upon it an immense amount of work foreign to its proper duties. Much of the dissatisfaction has been due to this very cause, and members have been alienated whose assistance was of the greatest value to us. We have seen the camel crowd into our tent and force out everything else, and it is time that this fruitless and thankless task, which was put upon the association, be now put off and the department created for the allotment and apportionment of dredging work and contracts be abandoned and all rules pertaining thereto be repealed.

The association should, on the other hand, favor the creation of pools in each district formed upon the lines of other successful business arrangements of like character.

The association as a whole will then confine itself to legitimate business of acquiring work and promoting the resources of members for doing work, leaving to the separate pools the business of dividing up that work at good prices.

TO THROW ALL RESOURCES ON PROJECTS.

We count in this association the membership and influence of every man engaged in the business; each one has something of value to us in the way of ideas, talent, energy, or influence, and it is the work of the association and its proper object and function to use these various factors for the benefit of the whole membership, and to throw upon any desired point the full resources of the association. In this way and by turning its steps in the right direction and with the full confidence and cooperation which it would then have from all its members, there no longer being any grounds for contention or rivalry amongst one another, when once this department of allotment was abandoned, the association will once more resume its proper place and perform many duties of the highest use and importance to its members.

The cost of its work would be distributed, and no member would have any cause for regretting that he was enrolled in its ranks.

If these views meet with your approval, your board would earnestly urge that, at least for a time, the district commission and all rules pertaining thereto be abrogated and discontinued; that the board of directors be instructed to arrange and appoint a series of committees, chosen of their own ranks, as well as from the entire membership, giving to each committee certain specified duties, which will include all matters which it is to the interest of the association to have promoted and studied. These committees should report from time to time to the board of directors, and the latter, being a representative body from all parts of the coast, would be most efficient in taking up and promoting all suggestions and measures requiring action.

No expense should be incurred by the committees, except as specially authorized by the directors from time to time and in cases where the necessity for such expenditures is apparent.

The board should organize a bureau of information, which would furnish to each member at regular intervals a synopsis of what is going on in the way of dredging operations on the coast, improvements in machinery or methods of doing work, with descriptions of such improvements, locations, etc., and the general work being done by and through committees and in the board of directors; this and such other additional information as may suggest itself.

This bureau should be in charge of a competent man, whose business is to procure and intelligently transmit matters of interest.

The question of insurance has never been adequately considered, and some measure should be taken up and carefully considered, so that a general scheme of insurance could be devised to secure some reduction of the large premium now paid by members to the insurance companies. Very little, if any, work of this kind has been done in our business, and it is believed that a system of employment of representative agents for our insurance would be found profitable and a great saving.

DREDGERS NEGLECTED THE PORK BARREL.

The lack of association methods and the failure to use the means in our hands for the general good was forcibly illustrated recently in the river and harbor bill, where absolutely no effort was made by the association to procure any amendment to the bill or any provision inserted therein for its benefit.

It also appears in the case recently of certain collisions which occurred in the Savannah River, where the law at present provides that a dredge occupying a channel in navigable waters is doing so at its peril, and no damages resulting to the said dredge can be recovered. These and a great many instances could be cited to show the neglect that general interest of dredging men is receiving at this time and emphasizes the necessity for proper action by the association, to wit, such as this one was intended to be and should be.

Your board of directors desire to assure this association and its members that they have devoted their best efforts during the year just ended to a consideration of all matters affecting the interests and business of those for whom they have acted. They have appreciated that the duties which they assumed in accepting the offices of directors required them to give the necessary time to consideration of the matters entrusted to them, and they looked over the entire field of co-operative work, and have determined that the association could be made of great value to the members if conducted on the lines heretofore specified.

They are also of the opinion that the work which the association has been attempting to do, namely, the allotment of work among members, has been entirely contrary to the spirit of this organization, and has proven a stumbling block in all its efforts to promote the general interests of its members. We feel that by means of thorough reforms in our methods, such as has been outlined, that the organization will rapidly add to its membership, and soon include all the operators on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts; that there will no longer be any reason why anyone engaged in the business should not join with us in our efforts to promote the business and encourage the giving of work by those having it in their power to do so, as well as the many other features which have been touched upon in this our report.

The board have held meetings on the second Wednesday of every month except the months of July and August, during which latter months the constitution provides a recess shall be taken, and the meetings have been well attended.

BOARD IS TO WORK FOR PORK BARRELS.

Your board feels regret that the river and harbor bill has failed of passage, and considers it all the more important that the association should be organized for the purpose of adding its influence to urging work by municipal organizations and bodies and doing all in their power to create offerings of work in the various ports of entry and harbors. It is only by persistent effort that the loss entailed upon us by the failure of the harbor bill can in any way be compensated for. Your board further wishes to emphasize their regret that the annual banquet of the association has been allowed to go by default for two or three years. These entertainments do not entail any serious expense upon the association, but they do create the greatest possible prestige for our business in the estimation of those whose favor it is to our advantage to gain. Influential public men and men of business affairs having to do with transportation companies and steamship lines are entertained by us on these occasions with the greatest possible benefit to our business—municipal officers, heads of departments, Members of Congress and of legislatures—and their favor and interest is legitimately gained and has been found to be of the greatest value when circumstances required it. The expense of our entertainment is wisely expended and brings an adequate return for every dollar so spent.

We might also add that the occasion also affords an opportunity for members to meet on holiday terms and encourages in every way good fellowship and kindly feelings among them. It is therefore to be hoped that in another year this banquet will be again a feature of the association.

The work of the association has been so largely confined to the burdensome details of allotment and district commission work during the past year that very little of general interest has developed.

We have done the best we could with the allotment problem and have done even better than an association of this kind could have been expected to do; but we hope that the whole matter will be relegated to other agencies and the efforts of this association left untrammelled for the coming year to perform the duties for which it is properly fitted.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Dated New York, March 13, 1901.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
By FRANK A. FUERST, *President*.

THE LOBBY AND THE DREDGERS.

The following data, also presented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in speech of September 29, 1914, links up the two organizations that profess to control allotments of appropriations and contracts:

[National Rivers and Harbors Congress: JOSEPH E. RANSELL, president, Washington, D. C., and Lake Providence, La.; J. F. ELLSON, secretary and treasurer, Cincinnati, Ohio; John A. Fox, special director, Washington, D. C.]

WASHINGTON OFFICE, 1910.

To the business interests of Baltimore, Md.:

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is working earnestly to secure the adoption by the Federal Government of a permanent waterway policy that will provide for improving all the worthy waterways of the Union.

The improvement of the canals and waters of the Atlantic coast, in which Baltimore has such a direct and vital interest, should be among the first to receive the benefit of the increased and regular appropriations for rivers and harbors that this organization is working to bring about.

Funds are needed to carry on the work which the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has persistently urged, and to the end that a strong demand may come from every section of the Republic we earnestly invite your financial cooperation.

John M. Williams is authorized to receive and receipt for all moneys that may be subscribed. He is working under the direction of and reporting to the undersigned officers of the congress.

Very respectfully,

JOS. E. RANSELL,
President.

P. S.—We earnestly urge the people of Baltimore to contribute to the support of this great work.

DAVID H. CARROLL,
Vice President.
JOHN R. SHERWOOD,
Director.

The Dredge Owners' Protective Organization assists. Witness the following:

[Dredge Owners' Protective Organization: Frank A. Fuerst, chairman. William P. Ryan, secretary. Executive committee: F. A. Fuerst, George Leary, John Gerrish, J. McMullen, P. Sanford Ross, W. J. Bradley.]

BALTIMORE, MD., August 4, 1910.

Mr. JOHN M. WILLIAMS, General Agent, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I find yours of the 1st instant awaiting my return to the city this morning.

Replying to your inquiry, I am submitting below a list of our members for your confidential use, as follows:

- Morris & Cumings Dredging Co., 17 State Street, New York.
- Eastern Dredging Co., 247 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Mass.
- Newark Meadows Improvement Co., 62 Cedar Street, New York.
- American Dredging Co., Mariner & Merchants Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
- W. H. Beard Co., 21 State Street, New York.
- International Contracting Co., 17 State Street, New York.
- Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co., Park Row Building, New York City.
- P. S. Ross (Inc.), 277 Washington Street, Jersey City, N. J.
- Hy Steers (Inc.), 17 Battery Place, New York.
- North American Dredging Co., San Francisco.
- American Dredging Co., San Francisco.
- Sanford & Brooks Co., Baltimore.
- Coastwise Dredging Co., Bank of Commerce Building, Norfolk.
- Norfolk Dredging Co., 217 Water Street, Norfolk.
- Bowers Southern Dredging Co., Galveston.
- Breyman Bros., East Boston, Mass.
- J. S. Packard Co., 31 Market Square, Providence, R. I.
- Daly & Hannan Dredging Co., Ogdensburg, N. Y.
- Bay State Dredging Co., 185 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
- R. Moore, Mobile, Ala.

Yours, very respectfully, W. P. RYAN, Secretary.

Here is the confidential collector of the "congress" receiving a confidential list of the dredgers' association from its secretary for the purposes of securing funds from the dredgers to aid the River Congress in putting through an annual pork barrel for Baltimore projects and for other localities.

These look like encouraging prospects, but no statement discloses their purpose in the statement before me:

- Key Compton, president Chesapeake Steamship Co., Pier 19, Light Street Wharf.
- Capt. W. C. Ellason, president Tolchester Co., Pier 16, Light Street Wharf.
- Capt. Willard Thomson, vice president and general manager Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway, Pier No. 1, Pratt Street.
- Clarence Shriver, agent, Ericsson Line, Pratt and Light Streets (second floor).
- John C. Whitney, president Merchants & Miners Transportation Co., Light and German Streets.
- Harry G. Skinner, president Skinner Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Locust Point.
- William E. Woodall & Co., South Side of Basin.
- James C. Gorman, agent Atlantic Transport Co., No. 201 Chamber of Commerce Building.
- Robert Ransay Co., No. 705 Keyser Building.
- A. Schumacher & Co., agents North German Lloyd Co., Gay near Baltimore Street.
- Dresel Rauschenberg & Co., No. 319 Chamber of Commerce Building.
- Winfield S. Cahill & Co., South Side of Basin.
- Mason L. Williams, Baltimore & Carolina Steamship Co., No. 604 Union Trust Building.
- W. E. Slaughter, Eastern Shore Steamboat Co., Pier 5, Pratt Street.
- John C. Bosley, manager Steamer Dreamland, Browns Wharf.
- F. W. Wood, president Maryland Steel Co., Sparrows Point, Md.
- Wallace Stebbins (Cons.), Charles and Lombard Streets.
- Walter Ancker, superintendent floating equipment, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Baltimore and Charles Streets.
- O. F. Lackey, engineer, harbor board, City Hall, Baltimore.
- John W. Hook, president Old Town Bank, Gay and Exeter Streets.
- George C. Thomas, No. 529 Law Building.
- William B. Hurst, care John E. Hurst & Co., Hopkins Place and Lombard Street.
- William H. Fehsenfeld, president Red "C" Oil Co., 111 Cheapside.
- Thornton Rollins, president Maryland National Bank, Continental Trust Building.
- Capt. R. M. Spedden, Third National Bank, Baltimore and North Streets.
- Mr. J. B. Bland, president United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Calvert and German Streets.
- Reuben Foster, No. 920 Equitable Building.
- B. N. Baker, No. 903 Calvert Building.
- Emmerson Drug Co. (Jos. Hends).
- Crom Cork Co.

The following list is only one that has come to my hands. Presumably there are others to be had if facts can be shown:

Baltimore subscribers to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Baltimore Steam Packet Co.	\$50
David H. Carroll (paid)	50
Maryland Steel Co.	50
Chesapeake Steamship Co.	50
U. S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co.	25
J. H. Whaley (paid)	50
Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.	50
Chas. C. Fulton & Co. (Baltimore American)	50
Emmon Drug Co., per J. Hinder (paid)	25
James A. Gary (paid)	25
William B. Hurst	25
Walter Anker, superintendent of Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.	50
The Red Oil Manufacturing Co.	25
The Crown Cork & Seal Co.	25
Woodward & Balwin Co. (paid)	50
The Deford Co. (paid)	25
Baltimore & Steamboat Co.	25
Duke, Peterson Hardware Co. (paid)	10

Old Town National Bank, Baltimore, Md., by John W. Hook, president (paid)	\$10
A. Schumacher (paid)	10
William E. Woodalls & Co. (paid)	10
The A. S. Abell Co. (Baltimore Sun)	50
Baker-Whiteley Coal Co. (paid)	10
Walter Ancker, Baltimore & Ohio Building, expires Feb. 4, 1911	5
Atlantic Transport Co., J. C. Gorman, manager, expires Dec. 5, 1908	50
Baltimore Steam Packet Co., John R. Sherwood, president: Expires 1908	50
Expires Feb. 4, 1910	10
Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, H. A. Wroth, secretary: Expires 1909	25
Expires July 19, 1910	25
W. B. Brooks, president Sanford & Brooks Co., 24 Commerce Street, expires, Feb. 1, 1910	5
Baltimore & Chesapeake Railway Co., Thompson G. Williams, vice president and general manager, expires Dec. 5, 1908	50
Chesapeake Steamship Co., Key Compton, president, expires Jan. 31, 1911	10
Consolidated Coal Co., J. H. Wheelwright, vice president, expires Dec. 5, 1908	50
Reuben Foster, 2301 North Charles Street, expires Dec. 5, 1908	100
Jacob W. Hook, Old Town National Bank, expires Jan. 24, 1911	5
Merchants & Manufacturers' Association, Thos. G. Boggs, secretary, expires Feb. 11, 1909, 1910, 1911	25
Maryland Dredging & Contracting Co., F. A. Furst, president, 803 Fidelity Building: Expires 1908	100
Expires Jan. 24, 1911	10
Merchants & Miners' Transportation Co., J. C. Whitney, president, expires Dec. 5, 1908	100
Manufacturers' Record Publishing Co., R. H. Edmonds, president, expires Jan. 5, 1907	10
John G. Ruge, care of Ruge Bros. Canning Co., 607 American Building, expires Nov. 27, 1909	5
Sanford & Brooks Co., expires Dec. 5, 1908	50
Tolchester Co., William C. Ellason, president, expires Dec. 5, 1908	25

Another matter of importance is developed by the Chief of Engineers' 1916 report which invites attention:

[From the minority report on the 1917 pending river and harbor appropriation bill, p. 13.]

DREDGING CONTRACTS AND ALLOTMENTS.

Specific evidence also has been placed in the RECORD, and resolutions of investigation introduced, concerning dredging companies and their activities with waterway lobbies and secret methods of allotting Government contracts. These resolutions affecting any secret activities of railroads, dredging companies, or other interests in connection with waterway bills before Congress are of public importance and should be pressed for consideration by those in either House possessing sufficient influence to ascertain the facts.

Evidence of apparent extravagance or fraud in the present method of letting contracts is offered in this connection. On October 8, 1914, this minority member of the committee placed before the House what purported to be a copy of a secret agreement among dredgers, wherein it appeared that a dredging board representing the various dredgers was engaged in fixing prices on Government contracts and allotting work to the members of the association, together with contributions and active lobbying to secure the passage of omnibus waterway bills.

Last session of the Sixty-fourth Congress the river and harbor bill carried a provision attempting to prevent excessive profits by private dredgers working for the Government. An examination of the Chief of Engineers' Report for 1916 shows that one particular dredging company was awarded all contracts on many different projects in the Baltimore district at one fixed price of 26 1/2 cents per yard. One project alone was excepted, and in that one contract let to another dredging company the contract rate for dredging apparently the same kind of material, sand and mud, was let at 7.9 cents per yard, or less than one-third of the favored company's many contracts (pp. 2109 to 2136, Report 1916).

No comparative Government cost is offered and no Government plant operated in the district.

Other contracts let to this same first-mentioned company on the Delaware River aggregated approximately \$450,000, according to the 1916 report, and were let at rates of 14.7 and 24.9 cents per yard, respectively, whereas three other contracts with two other companies on the Delaware project averaged about 9 cents per yard.

By a coincidence the same first-mentioned company has an exclusive contract on the James River, reaching 57 cents per yard for ordinary dredging, \$9.30 per yard for hard rock, and 17 cents per cubic foot for removing snags and stumps from a stream that was recommended for discontinuance by engineers, but was put in the bill by Congress over that protest. Did the dredging company influence that result? Why is the Government paying \$9.30 per yard for navigation on the James?

Another contract at Baltimore Harbor at a lower dredging rate, held by this same company, is one of numerous exclusive contracts which are at least open to inquiry when it is understood that this company, possessing so many exclusive Government contracts, some at questionably high prices, has for its president the same gentleman whose name purports to have been signed as president of the board of directors of the Atlantic and Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association, which association in past years secretly allotted Government contracts to its various members.

WHAT GOVERNMENT DREDGING COSTS.

On page 2212 of the 1916 report it appears that Government dredging on one project cost just 4.13 cents per cubic yard. Another project, page 2214, cost the Government 7.8 cents per yard, and still two others, pages 2216 and 2219, cost just 7 cents per yard. No attempt has been made to secure a thorough investigation of Government dredging contracts, but it is submitted that under the circumstances all the facts should be known, and to that end I have offered a resolution which speaks for itself:

Resolution.

Whereas the Government has appropriated \$898,543,252 for river and harbor improvements, including over \$240,000,000 for the Missis-

Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers, the larger part of which first-named enormous amount has been wasted and frittered away on extravagant, useless, and deserted waterways; and

Whereas the pending river and harbor bill carries approximately \$38,000,000 for river and harbor improvements in addition to nearly \$43,000,000 appropriated for the same purposes during this same session of the Sixty-fourth Congress; and

Whereas the pending river and harbor bill covers dribbling appropriations for the beginning of 80 new waterway projects in addition to \$29,000,000 contained in said bill for the maintenance or improvement of good, questionable, and useless old projects; and

Whereas the business judgment of Army engineers to properly determine the commercial value of thousands of projects heretofore approved by them has been open to criticism because of approval given to such governmental expenditures as the Norfolk and Beaufort \$5,400,000 canal waterway, the Chesapeake and Delaware \$8,000,000 project, the Cumberland River \$11,000,000 canalization project, the Black Warrior River \$12,000,000 canalization project, the Tennessee River \$17,000,000 canalization project, the Muscle Shoals Tennessee River \$18,700,000 waterpower and navigation project, the lower Missouri new \$20,000,000 navigation and reclamation project, the upper Mississippi \$28,000,000 navigation project, and the lower Mississippi navigation and reclamation project, which may exceed \$500,000,000, and also including scores of smaller wasteful waterway projects, such as the Trinity River and Brazos River, Arkansas River, Ouachita River, and Red River, each of which has received from the Government between \$2,000,000 and \$4,000,000 for practically useless and deserted waterways; and

Whereas another source of waste and extravagance in connection with Governmental waterway expenditures consists in the apparent lack of genuine competitive bids among private dredging companies doing business for the Government, which fact appears from contracts executed during the last year according to the Army engineers' report, and which is further indicated by secret understandings, agreements, and allotments of contracts; and

Whereas it is alleged that the dredgers of the country have in past years, through their official organization, sought to actively and secretly influence the passage of river and harbor legislation, as appears from the following extract, quoted from an alleged report of the board of directors of the Atlantic and Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association, issued after the defeat of a former river and harbor bill, which extract from the signed report reads as follows:

"We count in this association the membership and influence of every man engaged in the business; each one has something of value to us in the way of ideas, talent, energy, or influence, and it is the work of the association and its proper object and function to use these various factors for the benefit of the whole membership and to throw upon any desired point the full resources of the association. In this way, and by turning its steps in the right direction, and with full confidence and cooperation which it would then have from all its members, there would no longer be any grounds for contention or rivalry amongst one another. When once this department of allotment is abandoned the association will once more resume its proper place and perform many duties of the highest use and importance to its members." (An apparent admission that all contracts are or were controlled by the board of directors and subsequently allotted to the different members by a dredging trust); and

Whereas the directors' report further states:

"The board should organize a bureau of information, which would furnish to each member at regular intervals a synopsis of what is going on in the way of dredging operations on the coast, improvements in machinery or in methods of doing work, with descriptions of such improvements, locations, etc., and the general work being done by and through committees and in the board of directors—this and such other additional information as may suggest itself.

"The lack of association methods and the failure to use the means in our hands for the general good was forcibly illustrated recently in the river and harbor bill, where absolutely no effort was made by the association to procure any amendment to the bill or any provision inserted therein for its benefit"; and

Whereas the directors' report states:

"Your board feels regret that the river and harbor bill has failed of passage and considers it all the more important that the association should be organized for the purpose of adding its influence to urging work by municipal organizations and bodies, and doing all in their power to create offerings of work in the various ports of entry and harbors. It is only by persistent effort that the loss entailed upon us by the failure of the harbor bill can in any way be compensated for"; and

Whereas such report further states that Members of Congress and legislators have been banqueted and filled with viands solid and liquid to influence their judgment, as follows:

"Your board further wishes to emphasize their regret that the annual banquet of the association has been allowed to go by default for the last two or three years. These entertainments do not entail any serious expense upon the association, but they do create the greatest possible prestige for our business in the estimation of those whose favor it is to our advantage to gain. Influential business men and men of public affairs having to do with transportation companies and steamship lines are entertained by us on these occasions with the greatest possible benefit to our business—municipal officers, heads of departments, Members of Congress, and legislatures—and their favor and interest is legitimately gained and has been found to be of the greatest value when circumstances require it. The expense of our entertainment is wisely expended and brings an adequate return for every dollar so spent"; and

Whereas it is alleged that such dredgers have subscribed to the support of waterway lobbies engaged in securing the passage of river and harbor bills, and it is reasonable to believe from such statements that said dredgers' association is secretly and actively aiding in the allotment and control of Government dredging contracts, as suggested in such report; and

Whereas Col. C. McD. Townsend, president of the Mississippi River Commission caused to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 11, 1915, a carefully considered address, wherein he said:

"* * * Specifically, the writer would not abandon any navigable stream in the Mississippi Valley that has been partially improved, but would leave 58 of them in their statu quo, confining operations to snagging and the maintenance of existing works, and would concentrate appropriations on opening up a channel of the capacity of that existing on the lower and middle Mississippi to Chicago and Pittsburgh. * * * If the facilities thus afforded by the Government are utilized, the upper Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers should then receive attention"; and

Whereas we are asked to halt "improvements" on 58 river projects by Col. Townsend; and

Whereas no more impressive warning can be found on this same subject than in the minority report of the Sixty-third Congress by Senator Burton (S. Rept. 599, pt. 2), wherein he says, page 11:

"The waste which has been incurred in the canalization of rivers by the expensive system of locks and dams has been even worse than in improvement of open-channel rivers, the navigation of which has dwindled to such small proportions": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee of the House investigate and report back to the House at the beginning of the next session what waterways in its judgment deserve continued appropriations and what other waterways should be abandoned or allowed to remain in statu quo pending one or more experiments in waterway improvements, by them to be designated, and which are now being conducted at Government expense by Army engineers; and the committee is hereby authorized to call before it such witnesses as it sees fit in order to arrive at its decision.

Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee be further instructed to bring before it the officers and board of directors of the Atlantic and Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association, and such other parties as may be deemed advisable, and ascertain what efforts have been exerted toward securing the passage of the rivers and harbors bills in past years, its methods of allotments of contracts, and what connection, if any, such organization or the membership thereof have with the remarkable secret back fire urged in Congress in behalf of all such bills.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINEX, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20079, the river and harbor bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

NAVY YARD COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER. One day last week the President sent a message to the House with the report of the Navy Yard Commission. The Chair, not knowing that there were any illustrations, ordered the message and accompanying papers to be printed. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs informs the Chair that it is necessary to have the illustrations printed, and, without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, the following leaves of absence were granted:

To Mr. GALLIVAN, for three days, on account of death in the family.

To Mr. LITTLEPAGE, for two days, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SILENT PICKETING.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have read from the Speaker's desk a telegram received from the chairman of the State committee of the National Woman's Party of Colorado in regard to picketing the White House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., January 19, 1917.

HON. CHARLES B. TIMBERLAKE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Press report to-day quotes Congressman EMERSON as protesting in House against silent picketing by Congressional Union. State committee of National Woman's Party of Colorado upholds silent picketing by Congressional Union as necessary protest against undemocratic blocking of Federal suffrage amendment by President and party in power. Please have this protest read into CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BERTHA W. FOWLER, State Chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago I was permitted to insert in the RECORD a peace document. I ask unanimous consent to insert four other documents, bringing the peace effort up to to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 23, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation made by the District of Columbia appropriation act of September 1, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1970); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for post allowances to diplomatic and consular officers in China, including Hongkong, for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1971); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Ordnance Department at Large, United States Army (H. Doc. No. 1972); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting estimates for the relief of certain disbursement officers of the Army (H. Doc. No. 1973); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FOSTER, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16749) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to collect and publish statistics on the production, manufacture, and marketing of crude petroleum, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1330), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19122) to amend the act of Congress of February 17, 1911, entitled "An act providing for the purchase or erection, within certain limits of cost, of embassy, legation, and consular buildings abroad," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1332), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. McKENZIE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4359) to amend the military record of William O. Sarber, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1327), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9402) for the relief of Sylvester Hannan, alias Henry Edwards, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1328), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 147) for the relief of John W. Cupp, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1329), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. TILSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14763) for the relief of Charles Lynch, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1331), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCracken: A bill (H. R. 20351) to provide for an investigation and report relative to the adoption of a system of old-age insurance or pensions; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. Esch: A bill (H. R. 20352) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," as amended, in respect of car service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. Fuller: A bill (H. R. 20353) concerning proof of widowhood in claims for pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. Borland: A bill (H. R. 20354) to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. Taylor of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 20355) to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20356) to provide for the publication of an official journal; to the Committee on Printing.

My Mr. Hefflin: A bill (H. R. 20357) to prevent work on streets and buildings on Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. Oliver: A bill (H. R. 20358) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," as amended, in respect to car service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. Bailey: A bill (H. R. 20359) to provide increased revenue by a direct tax on the value of land in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Vare: A bill (H. R. 20360) providing for the erection of a monument in memory of the late Admiral George Dewey at the entrance to the Philadelphia Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. Wickersham: A bill (H. R. 20361) to prohibit the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. Sinnott: A bill (H. R. 20362) providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. Cary: Resolution (H. Res. 463) directing the Secretary of the Navy to cancel certain orders for shells; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. Slemm: Resolution (H. Res. 464) authorizing the printing of 10,000 copies of the opinion of the Interstate Commerce Commission relating to the car-supply investigation; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. Frear: Resolution (H. Res. 465) authorizing the Judiciary Committee of the House to investigate and report on waterways; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. Taylor of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 345) restricting the right to vote for Senators and Representatives in Congress and presidential electors to citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. Emerson: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 346) to amend the Constitution so that the President may approve or disapprove any appropriation bill item by item; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. Ashbrook: A bill (H. R. 20363) granting an increase of pension to Andrew P. Grubaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. Blackmon: A bill (H. R. 20364) granting a pension to Flora A. Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. Cary: A bill (H. R. 20365) granting an increase of pension to Fred J. Luepke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20366) for the relief of Ray Markey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. Coleman: A bill (H. R. 20367) granting a pension to Harry H. Fergus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. Cramton: A bill (H. R. 20368) granting an increase of pension to William I. Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

My Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 20369) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20370) granting an increase of pension to Robert Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRUKKER: A bill (H. R. 20371) for the relief of Emily Davison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 20372) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Wardlaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORDON (by request): A bill (H. R. 20373) to authorize the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint George L. Morrison captain of Cavalry, to take rank as such next after Capt. James A. Mars; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 20374) granting an increase of pension to Catherine J. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20375) granting a pension to John H. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20376) granting a pension to Phoebe Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 20377) granting an increase of pension to Haziah George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 20378) for the relief of Arthur H. Loomis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20379) for the relief of Alma Harris; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 20380) granting an increase of pension to Edward Grubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20381) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20382) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 20383) granting an increase of pension to George W. Fellers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20384) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda D. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20385) granting an increase of pension to Peter McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20386) granting an increase of pension to Amos McKinley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 20387) granting a pension to George C. Presley, Lansing, Mich.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 20388) granting a pension to Sarah Katharine Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 20389) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Philpot; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 20390) for the relief of J. W. Riser; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 20391) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bolinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 20392) granting a pension to Otto H. Staron; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 20393) granting an increase of pension to William H. Atwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 20394) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20395) granting a pension to Lillian T. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 20396) granting an increase of pension to William C. Waddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20397) granting a pension to Samuel Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20398) granting a pension to Isom W. Foley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20399) granting an increase of pension to Fred Leick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 20400) granting an increase of pension to William S. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 20401) granting an increase of pension to William H. Atwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20402) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20403) granting an increase of pension to Dr. Grant J. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 20404) granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 20405) for the relief of Capt. Ellis B. Miller; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 20406) granting an increase of pension to John M. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20407) granting an increase of pension to Virginia O. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 20408) granting an increase of pensions to John Weatherington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 20409) to correct the military record of Charles R. Pennybacker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the United Commercial Travelers of America, in re tariff legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of the Sedalia (Mo.) Young Men's Christian Association, favoring prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Mrs. J. Willis Fulton and 43 ladies of the Missionary Society of the First Baptist Church of Newark, Ohio, in favor of House bill 10924; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of William A. Kelley, Alex. Duncan, U. E. Swartzentruber, Joseph Marino, John W. Spence, George Barrett, Jonathan Hudson, Andrew Boyle, D. C. Murphy, J. H. Hampton, William Shimelous, Edward Fisher, Joseph Fisher, J. W. Brewer, William Mason, Richard Johnson, J. E. Dingle, Joseph Ford, John Mugridge, George Steele, James Pantano, George Tranter, Timothy Pitchford, Jacob Rupert, Charles P. Joll, John Resenwitz, Michael Hein, Samuel Fry, C. O. Dimond, W. R. Mandelstein, John M. Quinn, William L. Orris, Angus Gite, McClelland Steele, Thomas Williams, James Dursch, J. M. Bertel, William Helsel, John E. Walls, A. H. Leurue, John F. Dalton, C. W. Roberts, H. L. Rosenberg, Alfred Lane, A. J. Lane, A. E. Smith, H. J. George, J. L. George, C. E. George, G. R. Young, S. J. Dolan, Thomas J. Lewis, H. E. Crissey, R. C. Sackett, R. C. Bloom, Joseph Morris, D. A. Boyer, J. S. Twist, F. J. Baley, George W. Bottiche, Charles Gusky, J. J. Goughnour, Rev. J. C. Brown, Turner Chappell, Homer C. George, and Harry W. Dunmire, all of South Fork, Pa., for the passage of an act placing an embargo on the shipment of foodstuffs abroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Workers' Nonpartisan League of Altoona, Pa., in re labor legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of R. F. Schmitt, A. Franz, Joseph S. Ruffennach, Charles T. Warashis, John Zobczak, George Range, Adam Warashis, W. P. Heckman, A. A. Frauenheim, J. Z. Wainwright, C. H. Ridall, E. H. Straub, E. J. Vilsack, John F. Mueller, A. H. Sunshine, A. H. Behrenberg, A. F. Steigleder, and A. J. Vilsack, all of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., against bill for prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the First Baptist Church, the Methodist Church, the Christian Church, the English Lutheran Church, the Grace Reform Church, the Epworth League, the Christian Endeavor Society, the Lutheran League, the Methodist Bible School, and the First Christian Bible School, of Duquesne, Pa., and the Epworth League of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Crafton, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 92 citizens of nineteenth ward of Pittsburgh, Pa., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Pittsburgh Brewing Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., and Manufacturers and Dealers' League of Western Pennsylvania, against the bill for prohibition for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of post-office clerks and carriers at Coraopolis post office, Pennsylvania, in favor of the Madden bill, House bill 17806; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of National Association of Manufacturers of Medicinal Products, favoring Senate bill 6834

and House bill 17396; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of T. M. Gilmore, of Louisville, Ky., opposing prohibition for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Massachusetts Real Estate Exchange in re old-age pensions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of McLane Tilton, Jr., of Pell City, Ala., in re Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: Petition of 71 citizens of Lee County, Miss., for a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Central Federated Union of New York, protesting against any prohibition bills and favoring increase of wages for Federal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Wisconsin Daily League, opposing Senate bill 807; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by 700 voters of fourth district of Wisconsin, protesting against the passage of House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850, all dealing with the liquor traffic; also petition of William S. Allen, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of the above bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of National Association of Manufacturers of Medicinal Products, favoring Senate bill 6834 and House bill 17396; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees, in re eight-hour legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES: Memorial of the Montgomery County (N. Y.) Pomona, against an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of electrical workers of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 137, providing for the investigation of mills and its products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Petition of Baptist Men's Class, of Conneaut; Baptist Young People's Union, 50 people, of Conneaut; 80 people of Conneaut; Mission Sunday School, 40 people, of Conneaut; Pentecost Mission, 50 people, of Conneaut; Young People's Christian Endeavor, Christian Church, 35 people, of Conneaut; Mission Bible Class, 20 people, of Conneaut; Congregational Women's Class, 55 people, of Conneaut, Ohio, for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of 1,700 residents of Des Moines, Iowa, 100 residents of Indianola, and 235 residents of Des Moines, Iowa, for national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of Massachusetts Real Estate Exchange, in favor of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of sundry residents of New Jersey, for woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of National Association of Manufacturers of Medicinal Products, for Senate bill 6834 and House bill 17396; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Building Association League of Illinois, asking that building and loan associations be exempted from payment of corporation tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, opposing prohibitory bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of United Spanish War Veterans, in re legislation for Quartermaster Corps clerks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: Petition of Samuel E. Ver Treez, of Richmond, Ind., protesting against the slaughter of cattle under a certain age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 20315, for relief of James Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Memorial of the City Park Baptist Church, of Denver, Colo., for the Sims-Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of 150 people, 33 people, Christian Church, and 78 people, all of Denver, Colo., for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Papers to accompany House bill 18613, for relief of William Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Edward Grubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 16899, for relief of Storer Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Mary J. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Jesse Edgerton and 53 other citizens of Damascus and Salem, Ohio, against military training as a compulsory matter either in schools or among adult citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Samuel Phillips and 27 other citizens of Salem and Damascus, Ohio, against military training in schools or adult citizens by compulsory methods; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Memorial of men's class of the First Baptist Church of Mansfield, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVER: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of J. W. Riser; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Moses Silverman, of Baltimore, Md., opposing House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Woodmont Rod and Gun Club and D. W. Thom, both of Baltimore, Md., favoring the Hitchcock-Flood bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry residents of Baltimore, Md., against military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of C. J. Cary, of Baltimore, Md., opposing preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR (by request): Petition of United Brethren Church of Philomathe, Oreg., for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN: Resolution of Water Front Workers' Federation of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., indorsing appropriation in public-buildings bill of \$600,000 for new marine hospital buildings at San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NORTON: Memorial of General Crook Post, No. 33, Grand Army of the Republic, Devils Lake, N. Dak., favoring passage of the retired volunteer officers' bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OAKEY: Petition of school committee of the city of New Britain, Conn., advocating the passage of the Smith-Hughes bill, House bill 11250; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. PATTEN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, against prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of sundry citizens, opposing prohibitory bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Hackensack (N. J.) business and professional men, in re naturalization laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Red Bank, N. J., opposing mail-exclusion bills; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of sundry residents of Oneida County, N. Y., favoring the expenditure of certain funds for good roads through the State department of highways under the supervision of the Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of sundry citizens, opposing prohibitory bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition signed by several hundred citizens of Portsmouth, N. H., protesting against the passage of House bill 18986, Randall mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 4429, Bankhead mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 1082, Sheppard District of Columbia prohibition bill; House joint resolution 84, nation-wide prohibition bill; and House bill 17850, Howard bill to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 23, 1917.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee seeking Thy guidance as we face the uncharted paths of a new day. Thy law changes not. Thou art the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Thy unchangeableness is a guaranty of the blessings that have come to us out of the past, our rich inheritance, and prophecies as well the coming days of gladness, and hope, and light. We pray Thee to give to us Thy grace that our minds may be instructed; that our hearts may be responsive to the Divine command; that all things in our lives may be ordered according to